THE

CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXVIII.] OCTOBER, 1859. [Vol. XV.

ON EWALD'S THEORY OF CHRIST'S NON-RESURRECTION.

Sir,

In common, perhaps, with many readers of the *National Review*, I often feel somewhat sensitively afraid that its theological articles may be regarded by the public as representative of Unitarianism. True, it does not profess to be, nor is it in any sense, an organ of our body. Its conductors would, no doubt, disclaim the idea as distinctly as you or I can deprecate it. But the fact remains, that it is very generally considered to be such; and that general belief is explained by its known pedigree; for the *National Review* is the lineal progeny of the *Prospective Review*, which was the lineal offspring of the *Christian Teacher*, which Christian Teacher was edited by four leading Unitarian ministers whose names appeared on the cover. The public therefore take for granted (erroneously, but not quite unnaturally) that, as the *National* differs from its quarterly compeers by admitting theological papers, which they exclude, its theology must point to Unitarian authorship. It is not quite a work of supererogation, therefore, on our part, as Unitarians, to declare now and then, when *ultra* German and anti-supernatural theories find favour in the able pages of that Review, that we have no sympathy with them, and do not think they are shared by any section of our body, or by any but the fewest individuals among us as the subtlest and most uncertain of their refined speculations.

In the July No. of the *National* there are two theological articles which excite in me this earnest desire to disown them in the name of Christian Unitarianism. One is intitled, "*Revelation; what it is not and what it is.*" I do not profess indeed to understand all the abstruse and shadowy thoughts here expressed, for I have tried in vain to learn what the National reviewer thinks revelation *is*. But if I understand any part of the paper, he decidedly thinks it is *not* anything supernatural (except in the new sense of supernatural as *supersensuous* or *spiritual*, which we have observed in the *National's* theology), nor anything unusual at any time or in any place. Speculations to this effect seem to me irreconcilable with the idea of an historical Judaism and an historical Christianity as revelations of the Divine character and will.

But the other paper is that on which I propose now to offer a few criticisms, as its positions respecting the resurrection of our Saviour are throughout intelligible even when vague, and are, in my opinion, irreconcilable with historical and scriptural Christianity. This article is intitled, *The Apostolic Age*, being a review of Ewald's sixth volume under that title. The avowed object of the reviewer is, indeed, "not to affirm, but simply to state the views of Ewald on the resurrection;" but no reader can fail of perceiving that those views have his general sympathy and assent. I copy the reviewer's own summary of them:

"He (Ewald) thinks that the interment in Joseph of Arimathea's tomb was only temporary, that some of the disciples would naturally claim the corpse, as those of the Baptist did their master's (Mark vi. 29), and that they actually deposited it in another grave in Galilee; that the discovery of the abandoned grave was the outward occasion and stimulus of a general realizing among the disciples of the spiritual presence of their risen Lord as they had known him, seen him, and heard him on earth; that there was a spiritual resurrection of him in the hearts of his followers; and that this was the result of the intense impression of Christ's person and working on earth, only that they viewed him now, after his resurrection, not as a mere resuscitated man, but as a superhuman being and only Son of God, the reflection in his glorified state of him whom they had known in his terrestrial state as the Messiah. He considers John's the most complete account of the resurrection, and remarks in a note, that this disciple believed in the fact without any visible appearance. Of such visible manifestations he observes that John gives only a few specimens; and that the narratives contained in the supplementary chapter xxi. fall into four sections, in which the sensible appearances assume successively a steady increase of distinctness; and that Christ was most distinctly seen in Galilee. It was only believers who saw him after his resurrection, Paul's being an exceptional case. Ewald compares the Christophanies of the New Testament with the Theophanies of the Old, and regards the visions of Paul and the Apocalypse of John as only fainter examples of the same class of phenomena with the resurrection of Christ. As God under the old dispensation revealed Himself to men of God, so Christ under the new only to the converted and believing: and in both cases it was only at the commencement of the respective dispensations that such appearances occurred; they gradually became rarer and fainter, and at length ceased altogether. He has noticed that in Luke, ch. xxiv., these manifestations are limited to the Sunday of the resurrection; though the same author, in Acts i., afterwards gives them a wider range. When a belief in the resurrection had become prevalent, many passages in the Old Testament were supposed to predict it; and this furnished the Christians with a second proof of its reality. Among such passages, the story of Jonah had its influence on the conception of Christ's restoration from the dead. Hence arose the Christian tradition (Luke xxiv. 27), that after his resurrection Christ proved from the Scriptures that it was appointed for him to die and rise again.

"According to Ewald, the ascension was a return into heavenly glory, after Christ had shewn himself for a brief period of forty days on earth.

There was a natural disposition to assign a definite limit to these manifestations, and forty was a sacred number among the Jews. Christ's ascension he compares with Elijah's; and remarks generally, that the language and imagery of the Old Testament have contributed largely to mould and develop the idea. His return from heaven to judge the world and finish the present dispensation of things, was expected as the necessary sequel and completion of the ascension; for Christ alone could complete what he had begun." *(National Review,* July, pp. 142, 143.)

Such is Ewald's theory; such his treatment of the gospel history, rejecting its asserted facts and supplying others from mere conjecture. The first impression of a plain English theologian in reading it is, that it is essentially the same theory which was maintained by Woolston and others in England above a hundred years ago. But the suggestions which they were rightly understood (when apparently most grave and decorous) to make with an indirect view to disparage the Christian revelation, we are now bound to accept from German pens as seriously designed to illustrate and establish Christian truth. The mythical and allegorical interpretations proposed by the old English Deists, and their suggestions that *inward* impressions have, under the hands of the New Testament writers, grown into outward facts (or, in more modern phrase, subjective beliefs into objective realities), must be now re-examined by us, if possible, without any latent feeling that such explanations are fatal to Christianity itself. I would endeavour so to examine this theory. I do not, I am sure, wish to say one disrespectful word on German theology in general. For its deep and varied learning I profess the most profound respect. But under this term, German theology, is included every possible phase of thought, from soberest criticism to wildest speculation, from Rationalism more sweeping than that of English Deism to Orthodoxy as high as English Evangelicism, and not at all more respectable for the incongruous admixture of learning with its logical unreasonableness. It is notorious that the Germans regard theology (as they do literature and science also) as an open field for intellectual fence and tournay, in which if a man can win his spurs to-day, he cares little what may become, a month hence, of the steed that carried him. A theory need not be true in order to be notorious and clever. The National reviewer himself ascribes to Ewald certain qualities of mind that call forth my suspicion rather than sympathy towards his theoretic theology, while they leave unabated my faith in his Hebrew scholarship. "The arrogance and self-sufficiency so conspicuous in his earlier works have undergone no abatement with time. He writes still as if he were the first who had caught the true meaning of this history, acknowledging no services from the scholars of a former generation and admitting no co-operation from the present. The only modern authority he quotes is himself." "He is open to more serious charges than

these. Unfairness to others prevents him from always doing justice to himself. He would rather go wrong in his own track than walk in any footsteps already imprinted on the field of his labours." (Pp. 119, 120.) I assume no mock modesty therefore about criticising such a scholar's theory of the resurrection of Christ. It lies quite within the bounds of English scriptural knowledge and criticism. It professes indeed to be itself a scriptural theory, a scheme for the satisfactory explanation of the scriptural beliefs and assertions respecting the resurrection of Jesus Christ. I do not think it difficult to shew that such a scheme is utterly inconsistent with the scriptural facts adduced and with others suppressed.

"*He thinks* the interment in Joseph's tomb was only temporary, and that the disciples *would naturally* claim the corpse (as John the Baptist's had done his), and that they *buried it in Galilee*." Now the simple fact is, that (according to the Gospels) they did ask for the corpse and did bury it in a disciple's garden, namely Joseph's. What need of all this additional theory? What a perversion of the instance of John the Baptist's burial, the analogy to which is perfect as the evangelists have left the matter! Of what use was the suggested removal of the corpse from Jerusalem to Galilee? Then how was it to be done if desired? and when? On the Sabbath? the Jewish Sanhedrim permitting (not to mention Roman soldiers employed by them)? And by whom? Who were the disciples, more believing than apostles, that were ready to do this? And for what purpose, after all? To prove a *bodily* resurrection, when they only believed that *his spirit had left his body?* But I need not propose a new "trial of the witnesses;" the question now being, not whether those witnesses are honest, but whether the theory that Christ's body was not raised is consistent with their carefully examined evidence.

"The discovery of the abandoned grave (says Ewald) was the *outward occasion* and *stimulus* of a general *realizing* among his disciples of the *spiritual presence* of their risen Lord;" "there was a *spiritual resurrection of him in their hearts;*" and "this was the result of the intense impression of Christ's person and working on earth," &c. I can only say I read the very reverse of all this in the scriptural account of the discovery of the abandoned grave. It did not suggest the thought of the resurrection to the women nor to the disciples. And why, again, need it have been empty to suggest his *spiritual* resurrection? The corpse would better suggest that. The gospel narratives say it was his living bodily re-appearance which first convinced the disciples that he was risen, candidly owning that they had not till then understood either the scriptural intimations or his own prophecy that he should rise from the dead. Was, then, "the belief of his spiritual resurrection the result of the intense impression of his person and working"? Quite the contrary.

That impression revived with his bodily re-appearance, if we read the scripture history in the order of its events, and do not change the effects there traced into their own causes.

That this is done by Ewald's theory I proceed to point out. He begins with noticing and making very prominent the fact of St. Paul's "belief in a present and heavenly Lord," which he regards as the central idea of the apostolic age. The reviewer himself says:

"In the book of Acts and in the Pauline Epistles, the most superficial reader must be struck with the fact that the grand idea, the spiritual atmosphere, as it were, pervading these writings, is *not the remembrance of a departed and earthly teacher*, but the belief in a *present and heavenly Lord.* This is pre-eminently the case with Paul. The thought of the risen Christ is the inspiration of his whole being." * * * * "If anything is clear in the writings of Paul (and no writings breathe an intenser spirit of conviction), it is that he firmly believed in *Christ as a divine personage* who was the head of a new dispensation, a medium of access to the invisible God, *the source from which God's Spirit was immediately effused* on the hearts of believers, the *present object of their invocation* in seasons of trial and danger, and, summing up in his person the collective interests of humanity, the dispenser of a new spiritual and deathless life, as Adam had introduced the natural life, with its penal adjuncts of sin and death. As a consequence of this intense persuasion, 'eternal life,' a life beyond the veil of sense, becomes for the first time in human history a present reality to the mind; no longer a beautiful dream, a sublime speculation, an earnest longing,—the only forms under which the idea had expressed itself in heathenism,—but a great spiritual fact, of which that first generation of believers had no more doubt than they had of their daily life."—P. 140.

This beautiful description is true in the main; but distorted and exaggerated, I think, in certain particulars. In the book of the Acts, I do not find the belief of the heavenly Lord so permanent as the remembrance of the earthly teacher. In the recorded preaching of all the apostles, not even excepting Paul, the reverse seems to me the case. "They preached Jesus and his resurrection." But what is true of Paul's preaching and writings in a certain degree, and was natural and explainable by the fact (admitted by the reviewer, though not by Ewald) that Paul had not known Jesus during his earthly life, seems to me to be overstated in reference even to Paul, and quite a misstatement as extended to the whole apostolic church. I see no proof that Paul regarded Jesus Christ as always "present." His "visions of the Lord" tell me the contrary. The expected "coming of Christ" is a proof that he was not regarded as always present on earth, though "interposing in heaven" on behalf of his church. That "Paul believed in Christ as a divine personage," "the source from which God's Spirit was effused," and "the present object of their invocation in seasons of trial and danger," are assertions quite unsupported by anything I can find in his

writings; but which I am not sorry to see made in this review, as they plainly throw the responsibility of its very sceptical theory upon orthodox shoulders; for no Unitarian can have written this article. With these exceptions to the overstatement with which he seems chargeable, I accept the reviewer's picture of the vivid realization of the idea of a risen and immortal Christ, and of the belief in human life eternal, as characteristic (though not the only characteristic) of the apostolic preaching and thought. But in finding this great central idea, have we found a cause, or only an effect? How came this vivid belief in the heavenly Lord? It was not the original Jewish belief. It was not the Messianic idea. It did not so fully possess the minds of these men without some circumstances having put it there. Where shall we look for the explanation? Where but in the historical *records of the times just preceding?* The gospel histories tell us the *facts* to which it points back, and trace the progressive feeling with which those facts had been regarded. The "present and heavenly Lord" is nothing to Paul or any one, except as the consummation of the personal life and office of the earthly teacher. How did Paul himself gain this vivid impression of his heavenly Lord? By the vision at his conversion in which Christ appeared to him, is the evident answer; by the influence of convincing miracle. But what did that miracle teach him? How did the heavenly Lord on that occasion appear to him? In what capacity, in relation to what facts, powers or interests, was that Lord revealed to his so vivid perception? "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest," were the words that startled the persecutor into a believer. What were these words to Paul except as throwing him back upon the history of Christ's earthly life, as he had heard it narrated if he had personally known nothing of it, and of the infant church as bearing constant witness to that life, and to the death and resurrection? Paul had persecuted *somebody*, for *something* real or supposed. He had persecuted the disciples of Jesus; and he knew something, though not clearly, not candidly, not thoroughly, respecting their professed principles. Surely he knew that they preached Jesus as the promised Messiah, and as raised from the dead in attestation of his Messiahship. But our theorist and his reviewer, who, in defiance of historical order, begin their statement of the Christian phenomena with Paul's mature convictions respecting the immortal Christ, refuse thus to trace back the historical detail of facts, by which that conviction is explained in the oldest histories of the events, and attempt instead to solve the problem by a theory which has no historical foundation whatever. Why this disposition to make Paul's impression the starting-point of Christian history, instead of the living history of Christ himself? It seems to me a needless, if not wilful, inversion of the natural order of events. Is it said,

Paul's writings are (some of them, at least) the oldest books of the New Testament? Truly so; but their *material* is not the oldest. His mission is not the beginning of the gospel. His written impressions were founded on previous facts, and we can only obtain those facts from the gospel histories and the Acts of the Apostles. Whatever latitude we may allow ourselves in criticising those narratives, whatever colouring we may suppose to have been involuntarily given to the facts by the narrators, however late we may endeavour to place their supposed composition, those narratives are still our only source of information as to the actual origin and claims of Christianity. Ewald himself believes Paul to have disseminated a *written* gospel. For myself, I believe the existing four to be among the most faithful of histories, though not possessing nor claiming exemption from human error; and I believe the common opinion of their having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem to be quite beyond reasonable cavil. But, at all events, the gospel history can only be learnt from them. And whatever liberties a philosophical historian may take with them, I hold it impossible fairly to claim their statements, allusions or admissions, in support of a merely spiritual resurrection of Jesus Christ. His bodily restoration to life is their undoubted doctrine.

The advocates of the contrary hypothesis dwell much upon the asserted fact that the risen Jesus appeared to *believers only*. I do not feel so clear that this was absolutely the case. I do not so strictly limit Peter's words (Acts x. 41), that "God shewed him openly, *not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before* of God." Nor would Ewald or the reviewer usually *urge* a text so hard as they seem disposed to do this. Between "all the people" and "believers only," there were many possible grades of publicity; and it is inconceivable to me that, during forty days in Galilee, Jesus should have been seen by absolutely none but believers, especially if Paul is to be credited in saying, that "he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once;" for I do not suppose all Galilee believed to a man, or that the five hundred brethren's names were called over and unbelievers excluded from the assembly. But the believers were of course the only persons who cared to become public vouchers for the fact. These texts have been explained against Woolston and others often enough.

The "sudden presence and mysterious disappearance" of Jesus "on several recorded occasions," the *reviewer* says, "leave on the mind, in spite of several passages which are evidently intended to produce an opposite effect, a somewhat dim and vague, but nevertheless an almost irresistible impression, that we are here dealing with something different from the corporeal frame in which Jesus of Nazareth had once lived, and which a few days previously had been deposited in the grave." The reference of

course is to Luke xxiv. 13, "Their eyes were opened and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight (ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν); and perhaps also to John xx., where we are told that "when the doors were *shut for fear of the Jews,* Jesus came and stood in the midst" of his apostles; where some lovers of mystery believe it is implied that he entered without opening the door! I suppose, if the expression in John viii. 59, "Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple" (Ἰησους δὲ ἐκρύβη), had occurred after the resurrection, it might have seemed to denote an equally "mysterious disappearance;" and it might have been not unfairly urged that "hid himself" scarcely implies the full literal meaning of the Greek, which says, "was hidden,"—was made invisible to human sense, a mystic might have argued with some show of reason.

The reviewer next reminds us that "this is no new feeling in the Christian church;" and quotes Origen and others as holding "that the person of Christ, after the resurrection, was in a sort of *intermediate condition* between the grossness of its previous *corporeal vehicle* and the disembodied *apparition of the soul.*" I dare say we might find among the Gnostic advocates of a phantom Christ the same kind of interpretation applied to the ἐκρύβη during his mortal life. But this theory of an "intermediate condition" only perplexes our present question, as it does not sustain Ewald's theory that the resurrection was not a bodily, outward or visible fact at all, but only a spiritual, inward belief on the part of the apostles and disciples. Against that theory what can be more decisive than the record in Luke xxiv. 36—39? The disciples "were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they had seen a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." And then he asked for food and ate. The satisfaction so kindly granted to Thomas's doubts (John xx. 24—29), again, historically defies the theory of a merely spiritual and inward conviction of Christ's resurrection. And beyond doubt Luke's summary at the opening of the Acts (i. 3), equally discountenances the *subjective* theory: "To whom he *shewed himself alive* after his passion by many infallible proofs, being *seen of them* forty days, and *speaking* of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." But is it quite candid of the reviewer to speak of these passages as "*evidently intended* to produce an opposite effect"? Are they not evidently without design, except that of narrating fact?

I do not say, Mr. Editor, that this subject, as exhibited in the New Testament, is unattended with difficulties or obscurity. But Ewald's theory does not meet them; it only makes new ones.

The difficulties felt by religious minds are not, however (let me now observe), altogether *scriptural.* On the contrary, the Scriptures are made to bear the weight of difficulties artificially imposed upon them. Our reviewer thinks it surprising that "so much stress should have been laid by religious men on the fact of the *bodily* resurrection of Christ, as the only solid ground of belief in a life after death." Certainly, the bodily resurrection of Christ is, of itself, no proof of anything of the kind. It is grievous to think what foolish and strained analogies have been attempted. As if the miraculous restoration of Christ to life the third day was, or could be, in any sense a *pattern* of the resurrection of our bodies, which on the third day, we know quite well, have experienced a very different course in the order of nature. The Scriptures are not responsible for any such illogical suggestions. It was not the purpose of Christ's resurrection to prove the future life of man by *specimen or example.* Our reviewer says: "What we want is, not testimony to a restored life in *this* world (which has no bearing that we can see on the sublimest of human expectations), but direct evidence, if it can be got, of uninterrupted personal existence in the invisible state which lies *beyond* this world." Yes, truly, "*if it can be got.*" But *direct* evidence to this effect has never been given, and we know not how it can. It *was not got* on the supposition of Christ's spiritual resurrection. That Paul or any one else believed his spirit to be living separate from his body, was no more than Paul as a Pharisee already believed of every friend he had lost. A persuasion of the spiritual resurrection of Christ was no new proof or evidence, but only a new expression of a natural and desirable belief. Those who have written wisely on the resurrection of Christ and its bearings upon Christian belief, have kept clear of the absurdity here alluded to. Mr. Furness, for instance, concludes his most thoughtful and free-minded remarks on this subject in these wiser words, which sufficiently vindicate the outward resurrection:

"If Jesus had not re-appeared, I am wholly at a loss to conceive how his history could have escaped being buried with him. When he expired on the cross, there was not a man, even of his most intimate friends, who understood him.

"Here, in its obvious necessity to *give light and impulse* to his followers, do I discover the principal *object of his resurrection.* I am aware that the general belief is that he rose from the dead to establish the doctrine of the life beyond the grave. But it is not in this way that Christ confirms my hope of immortality. I behold in him, in all that he said and did, the exhibition of a spiritual and immortal nature. If he had appeared in an angel's garb and with an angel's wings, I could not have evidence that he belonged to another and imperishable world so strong as that which presents itself, not to my eye, but to my soul, my consciousness, in his moral lineaments. In his spiritual truth and greatness I behold an unearthly halo, the living light of eternity; and

as I discern and feel that, I feel and know myself to be possessed of a like immortal nature. So that it is not by the bare fact of his resurrection that I am convinced of another and unending existence. His resurrection, as it is a part and a prominent part of the grand spiritual manifestation, has its office in revealing the eternal world. But the primary purpose of his rising from the dead, as he himself more than once declared, was, like a sign from heaven, to vindicate his authority. His authority it did establish gloriously, so far at least as his immediate followers were concerned. Although they continued to cherish the Jewish hope of an outward kingdom, still his death and resurrection wrought with them to induce them to postpone that fond hope; and though they never appear to have relinquished it altogether, yet it gave way in their minds to the authority of him who had given such glorious attestations of the divinity of his mission and office." *(Jesus and his Biographers,* by W. H. Furness: Philadelphia, 1838, p. 428.)

I cannot add to the force with which these words describe the actual and necessary instrumentality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, as an outward and bodily fact, in producing that strong conviction of his living presence which Ewald assumes to have been stimulated by the mere "discovery of the abandoned grave." With the outward resurrection admitted, the *inward* conviction of the apostles has a sufficient cause; without it, that *inward* conviction is unnatural to those men in their known circumstances, and, if possessed by any of them, might be a mere subjective delusion, a fancy of their own minds, which they could not rationally vindicate or impart to others.

Neander, too (from whom the reviewer quotes a few speculative words implying that Christ rose to "a higher form of personal being as the commencement of a new life," &c.), is explicit enough in vindicating the necessity of the bodily resurrection as the only sufficient explanation of the after belief and conduct of the apostles, and in deprecating the attempt to explain the re-appearance of Christ on "*internal* grounds." He even glances at the Ewald theory and points out its inapplicability:

"The death of Christ annihilated at a stroke the Messianic expectations of the apostles. Their dejection was complete. But if, of all that they had hoped, nothing was ever realized, this dejection could not have passed away. It is true, we may suppose it abstractedly possible that, after the first consternation was over, the deep, spiritual impressions which Christ had made might have revived, and operated more powerfully and even more purely, now that they could no longer see him with their bodily eyes. But this view could not arise except along with the *recognition of an historical Christ* as the personal ground and cause of such a new creation; without the presupposition of such a Christ there is no possible foundation on which to conceive of such after workings.

"And even *with* it, we cannot explain (not bare conceivable possibilities, but) the actual state of the case, viz., the dejection of the apostles at *first,* and what they were and did *afterward.* There must be some intermediate historical fact to explain the transition; *something*

must have occurred to revive, with new power, the almost effaced impression; to bring back the flow of their faith which had so far ebbed away. The re-appearance, then, of Christ among his disciples is a connecting link in the chain of events which cannot possibly be spared. It acted thus: Their sunken faith in his promises received a new impulse when these promises were repeated by him risen from the dead; his re-appearance formed the point of contact for a new spiritual communion with him, never to be dissolved,—nay, thenceforward to be developed ever more and more." *(Neander's Life of Jesus Christ,* translated by M'Clintoch and Blumenthal: Sampson Low, 1848, p. 423.)

On the question, "Was the re-appearance of Christ a vision?' Neander says:

"Those who attempt such an explanation on *internal* grounds, suppose Christ's re-appearance to have been *a vision.* Now, in any vision (other than magical, and such are precluded by the hypothesis of this inquiry, which goes upon natural and historical grounds) a psychological starting-point is necessarily presupposed, even when the vision is said to be seen by one individual, much more when it is repeatedly seen, in the same way, by different individuals. But no such starting-point can be found in the mental condition of the apostles, such as it has been described. It is precisely in order to explain the change in that condition that we need another cause. How is it possible to derive from the psychological development itself a condition precisely its contrary? That were indeed a *petitio principii.*"—P. 424.

Having quoted Furness on this subject, let me add that his chapter on the Resurrection is, in my opinion, peculiarly calculated to meet every natural doubt and difficulty that arises in a free and devout mind in reading the scriptural accounts of that event. He freely admits discrepancies among the witnesses. He frankly reminds the reader that the hour was that of dim twilight and the interior of the sepulchre more dim still. He remembers the susceptibility of the female imagination, and admits the natural disposition of men as well as women, in such circumstances, to mix up the supernatural unduly with the natural; and out of all these admissions, or candid statements of the case rather, he brings out, as the necessary explanation even of every mistake or exaggeration, the actual resuscitation of the bodily frame of Jesus. Bearing in mind, too, Mr. Furness's somewhat bold speculations (to which I for one cannot assent) on the subject of miracles, which he makes to be instances only of a higher law of nature, namely, the supremacy of mind over matter, I feel that in his book a far more searching "trial of the witnesses" of Christ's resurrection has been conducted than they underwent at the hands of Woolston or of Bishop Sherlock, and that their testimony is fully established.

I have written a long letter, Sir—much longer than I meant or expected—but I have not yet done. I wish not merely to controvert, but to contribute, if I can, to the intelligent discrimi-

nation of scriptural difficulties and their explanations. Bear with me therefore, if you can, a little longer.

It seems to me, in few words, that all the scriptural facts on which Ewald founds his theory really belong to the question, *not of Christ's resurrection*, but of his *ascension*. These two events are strangely confounded both by him and the National reviewer. To keep them distinct, as the Scriptures do, not only by forty days' interval of time, but by an intire difference of conception as to the Saviour's personal state, will, I think, wonderfully clear the mist of speculation that has enveloped the subject.

It is the *ascended* Christ, and not simply the risen, whom Paul and the other apostles and all the apostolic age regard with so intense a faith as living for ever at the right hand of God, as supreme over his church, and about to return to judge the world.

We have seen how the Gospels describe Jesus during the forty days after his resurrection, as alive in bodily form, conversing with his disciples, eating with them, shewing them the wounds in his hands and feet and side. There is a mystery about the nature of his restored bodily life during this period which it seems to me mere folly and presumption to attempt to penetrate. Those who have suggested that it was a transition state intermediate between the gross bodily life and the purely spiritual, seem to me not to understand what they affirm, any more than those who point to it as the pattern of our immortal life. It was a miraculously restored bodily life, identical in its outward characteristics with that already familiar to the disciples; and our calling it miraculous should, I think, remove its *how* and *what* from physical or metaphysical speculation.

But the next step, the transition from the risen body to the invisible life eternal, is that which the Scriptures leave (and necessarily, I think) in most intire obscurity. Neither the *how* of the resurrection nor the *how* of the ascension is, I suppose, clearly conceivable; but the *result* of the former was a state analogous in outward manifestations to his previous life on earth, a state attested and described in similar terms. The *result* of the latter was the state beyond the human senses. From that moment Christ was either the remembered earthly teacher or the immortalized Lord. I suppose those who had seen him during the forty days had thenceforth a very different idea of his ascended from his merely risen state. St. Paul had probably not been present with the risen Christ. His "visions" were of the ascended and immortal. Now, of the latter state Paul speaks, and not of the former. Yet what he says of it is gratuitously confused with what others have narrated respecting the forty days of the risen bodily state.

The scripture narratives of the ascension (that is, of the moment of that event) are very vague and quite unsatisfactory to any one who insists upon "knowing all about it." If Ewald had

expressed doubts whether there was evidence to prove *a visible bodily ascension*, I might be content to doubt it too. He would rightly remind us that neither Matthew nor John (the two apostle-evangelists) tells us one word about it, both finishing their histories with the resurrection and the days in Galilee. He would rightly insist that Mark does not attest a *visible* ascension, his words being merely these: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven and sat on the right hand of God;" whence it would be fair to argue that the ascension (if conceived of as a moment of transition from earth to heaven) was merely *inferred* by the narrator to have taken place from the signs with which, as he tells us in the next verse, "the Lord, working with them, confirmed the word" of his apostles' preaching. The critic might further remind us that Luke in his Gospel says no more than Mark; and that it is only in the recapitulation at the beginning of the Acts that any attempt is made to *describe* the moment of Christ's ascension. It is done in these words: "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up (ἐπήρθη); and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up (πορευομένου αὐτοῦ), behold, two men stood by them in white apparel, which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up (ὁ ἀναλφθεὶς) from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven" (Acts i. 9—11). The critic is justified in saying that the above negative evidence against the visible and bodily ascent of Jesus from the earth into the air is very strong, and that the positive testimony is feeble and indistinct. He might suggest in reference to the ascension (what is so palpably inapplicable to the resurrection of Jesus) that a "psychological starting-point" existed for this vision in the fact of Christ's residence for forty days in Galilee and his disappearance thenceforth, his remembered declaration that he was returning to God who had sent him, and the reception of miraculous gifts by his apostles as he had promised. He might also urge that the actual ascent of a human body into the clouds could, if it happened, only intimate or suggest to minds quite unacquainted with the solar system the transference of life from a mortal to an immortal state, and that the same thing presented in vision would convey the same suggestion. All this obscurity and defect does rest, it is certain, on the *when* and *how* of the ascension; but it does not rest, I repeat, on the when and how of the resurrection morning and the forty days following; and I suggest to earnest and thoughtful readers of the New Testament that the obscurity in which Christ's ascension stands need throw no obscurity, still less doubt, around the fully described facts of his resurrection.

Of course our minds cannot rest (any more than those of the

apostles) with the resurrection of Jesus and his forty days in Galilee, though Matthew and John's Gospels leave us there. We go on to the day of Pentecost (the completion of those days) and meet the apostles at Jerusalem, where they receive the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit, and recognize them at once as "the promise of the Father which they had heard from Christ." If they had just left him on Mount Olivet with his fresh injunction to wait in Jerusalem till they should have received the Holy Spirit, they would not be surprised, after its descent, to meet him no more. If they had seen, or thought they had seen, him vanish behind a cloud when they parted, this still leaves unsolved to us all the curious but unprofitable questions with which we might perplex ourselves as to the locality of the heaven into which he was taken up, the nature of his bodily form when he entered it, and how the bodily form of his ascension may have differed from that of his resurrection, or how this last-named from that of his previous life. Idle questions all, and quite impossible of solution. I confess I know not—I do not pretend to know—what became of the risen bodily form of Jesus Christ; but if I can at all understand and may at all believe the Scriptures, I know on rational and full evidence that his mission received the all-important seal of his miraculous resurrection from the dead; and I am content to say and think as little as Paul or any of the apostles seems to have done about the presumed moment or act or manner of his ascension, content if I may know with them "the power of his resurrection," and share with them that developement of spiritual and immortal life which his life on earth manifests and his death to this life can only have perpetuated and exalted. He once lived our mortal life; he has entered upon the immortal state which we too hope to realize. And the intervening specialty of his bodily resurrection, by which he "was declared to be the Son of God with power," has not only confirmed his authority, but directed the hearts and hopes of Christians upwards and onwards in allegiance to him.

Mr. Furness is, I think, just as wise in his negative views respecting the ascension, as in his strong and distinct affirmation of the resurrection. You see, Sir, he keeps the two events separate. Ewald's theory comes of confounding them:

"I do not intend to dwell upon his ascension, because there is no language in any one of the four Gospels that necessarily implies that he ascended *visibly*. Matthew and John do not say a word about his final disappearance. Mark says, 'So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God.' We might with as much reason infer from this language that they saw him seated on the right hand of God, as that they saw him received up into heaven. When he bade them farewell, they concluded of course that he had gone to heaven, and that he was placed at the right hand of the Eternal throne, and they express themselves agreeably

to this impression. And so Luke says, 'And it came to pass while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven.' That he was separated from them is clear. They would so naturally conclude that he was carried up to heaven, that we cannot determine from this language whether they mean to say that they saw him carried up, or whether it was only their inference. I can only say that I am deeply struck with the silence of these accounts as to the mode in which Jesus came and went on the various occasions on which he presented himself to his disciples. That he did appear again and again to different individuals and to large numbers, they fearlessly declare. They are not deterred from stating the fact of his appearance at different times, by any apprehension of the doubts that might be stated as to the manner in which he appeared and disappeared. If they were conscious of any difficulty on this point, they still do not hesitate to say that he did appear. But I imagine they were unconscious of difficulty. After the death of a friend, in the first agony of our loss, how fondly do we pray that he would only come back once more, were it but for a moment, that we might look on him and hear him speak, or exchange a mute farewell! Could so much be granted to us, we feel ready to suspend all curiosity, to keep down within every question concerning the mode in which he might come and go. So was it with the disciples. When their Master was present, they were too much filled with awe, too tremblingly impressed, too anxious to catch every word that fell from his lips, to speculate about the way in which he came and went. There is to my mind a sublimity in the darkness which wraps the close of this history, analogous to what we perceive in the ways of Providence and Nature."—P. 429.

Again apologizing for the length of my own remarks, but not for that of such quotations as the above, I am, Sir, yours truly,

A Unitarian Minister.

September 2, 1859.

EXHORTATION.

(translated from the German.)

See, the day brightens in glad exultation,
Blue is the firmament, green is the plain;
Grief a false note in the song of creation;
Say, does our world wear a garment of pain?
Cast thy look upward and banish thy sadness,
Vast is the beauty prepared for the soul;
Virtue itself will conduct us to gladness,—
Gladness of wisdom, the long-promised goal.

Waken thy spirit to innocent pleasure;
Listen—it sounds in the nightingale's song;
Breathe—it scents roses in groves without measure;
Feel—with the brook it rolls softly along;

Taste—it gives sweetness to grapes in the bower,
Seasons our food in the rustic repast;
Look—it grows green in the herb and the flower,
Paints us a scene in the tree-covered waste.

Friends! wherefore womanly tears will you borrow,
Dimming your cheeks in their healthiest bloom?
Fitting to man is this feminine sorrow?
Would you despairingly sink in the tomb?
Much that is noble rests all unregarded,
Much that is good still remains to be done;
Duty's fulfilment by peace is rewarded;
Rest throws its shade when the conflict is won.

From our own frailties, by frailty surrounded,
Great is the suffering, sorrow and care;
Hope still is cordial to hearts the most wounded;
Bearing makes patience yet stronger to bear!
Round thee may gather the dark wave of trouble;
Look to the skies in thy loneliest mood;
Cherish reliance meek, manly and noble;
Goodness can reach but an end that is good!

Joyfully muse on creation most holy;
Fair is the nature of God and sublime;
Also forget not the prayer of the lowly,—
Deeds of beneficence hallow all time.
Love—for true love is divine in direction,
Innocence blessing the path we pursue;
Love too, with wise and embracing affection,
All that is beautiful, noble and true!

Traffic—for traffic the wise spirit braces;
Fortune and fame its attendants are borne;
Mark with fair deeds the evanishing traces
Of our too promising fugitive morn!
Happy to render the circle about us,
Useful to prove ourselves all as we may:
Oh! that gives rapture within and without us;
Oh! that enlivens the gloomiest day!

Courage! Our sorrows, if once they are over,
Freshen the soul, as the rain does the air;
Graves which the dark mourning cypresses cover,
Blooming forget-me-nots render more fair.
Friends!—our Great Father hath spoken the sentence—
Joy is our portion—a joy without guile;
Innocent gladness requires no repentance;
Rose-crowned, she meets even death with a smile!

S. F. Macdonald.

Chester, September, 1859.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE; OR, THE BRISTOL JURYMAN AND THE JUDGE:

A SERMON ON TITUS ii. 11—15: RECOMMENDED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE JUDGES.

EVERY now and then an incident occurs in actual life to remind us, and if necessary prove to us, how great is the practical value of our position as Unitarian Christians; how it keeps us in harmony with God's works and will in creation and providence, and enables us to see human life and all that belongs to it in a truly religious point of view, and to bring into contact with all our life's duties and enjoyments the elevating influences of the gospel of Christ, to a degree that is impossible under those aspects of Christianity which are known as "orthodox."

Reflections of this kind were lately forced upon us in connection with the death of the great scientific naturalist, Humboldt, and the jealousy of what calls itself "orthodoxy" towards his favourite scientific pursuits, as signified on occasion of his funeral by the clergy of Berlin. "Evangelical orthodoxy" confessed itself on that occasion, before the assembled world of science (the assembled students, that is, of the Creator's works), inadequate to supply the religious wants of the cultivated and scientific mind. We felt by contrast the blessedness of our large and liberal Christianity. We felt its truth. We felt that its destinies are linked with the world's progress and improvement.

Another incident has just occurred in our own country which exhibits in a still more familiar manner the unnaturalness of the orthodox system and its unsuitableness to the wants and uses of human life. Not only is it confessedly unfit for the intellectual demands of men of science; it is unfit to guide the actions of juryman or judge in an English assize court.

The incident is fresh in your minds. At the late Bristol assize a juryman objected to being sworn. The judge (Baron Bramwell) thinking he held that scruple as to taking an oath, which our law respects in the case of Quakers and others, encouraged him to explain his objection and state in what way he proposed to make his solemn declaration instead of the oath. It then appeared that the man objected to serving on a jury at all, because, he said, he did not think it accordant with the *doctrines of grace* to do so. The following dialogue ensued:—*Judge.* "Grace indeed! This is intolerable. I thought your objection was to the oath itself, to being sworn."—*Juror.* "That is my first difficulty."—*Judge.* "What has grace to do with earthly matters? Do you think it is predestined that a man shall have a verdict for or against him, and that therefore it would be wrong for you to interfere?"—*Juror.* "We are told in the 5th chapter of Matthew that we should suffer evil and not resist it."—*Judge.* "Then suffer the evil the law puts upon you. It is downright nonsense;

and the best thing I can say is that a man having such an idea in his head is not fit to be a juror." Counsel on both sides assenting, the judge added, "Get out of the box, but don't leave the court, because you are not to make a holiday by your nonsense." And the man's name being called the next morning and he not being there, the judge fined him £20.

This incident is full of instruction and warning to those who make religion absurd and impracticable (like this juryman), and to those who (like the judge) take for granted that it is absurd and impracticable, and therefore say it has nothing to do with earthly matters. Nothing to do with earthly matters! The doctrines of grace nothing to do with the solemn matters of a court of justice! Judge and juror to lay aside their deepest convictions and feelings as Christian and religious men, just when they are called upon to investigate matters of life and death, crime and innocence, right and wrong, between man and man! Can this be so? Does the judge, in his well-merited rebuke to a foolish, ignorant religionist, take care to save religion itself from the discredit of that man's ignorant folly, or does he take him as representative of religious men, and declare that religion is out of place in courts of justice? The latter is what the judge in effect did. And it is what is done continually in every circle of prescriptive orthodoxy, where sense and knowledge on general subjects prevail. Religion is by worldly men commonly regarded as beyond the application of sense and knowledge. It receives a passive, formal and conforming homage (at church and on Sundays chiefly), and is distinctly and in words repudiated as having nothing to do with secular or worldly things. Judge Bramwell has only avowed what the conforming orthodox community in general believe, that the doctrines of grace have nothing to do with worldly matters.

Perhaps it may be suggested that by the doctrines of grace the judge meant only what that stupid juror called so, and not what the Christian Scriptures designate by that name; for certainly in the Christian Scriptures the term grace is used as descriptive of the central principles of Christian faith and morals. But then, if certain absurd and unscriptural notions were embraced in the term by that Calvinistic juror (for such he seems to have been), it is a pity that an educated judge did not shew more discrimination, instead of abandoning religion itself to contempt and then turning it out of court.

Grace is one of several scriptural terms that are quite easy to understand and truly valuable in the religious beliefs and promises which they imply, if we will but take pains to understand their meaning, and especially if we will be content to take them as far as possible in their obvious and customary meaning, instead of making for them an artificial and arbitrary theological one.

I endeavoured to illustrate this, last Sunday evening, in the

instance of the word *faith*, which in common, daily, secular life means *belief* on the one hand, and *fitness to be believed* on the other—*trust* on the one hand, and *trustworthiness* on the other. In the language of the New Testament, faith means precisely this in its deepest religiousness, and ought to mean the same in the religious life of Christians. But faith has by too many expounders of the Scriptures been made to mean something quite different from this. It has been made the antithesis to knowledge and the antithesis to good conduct; and men have dared to say that faith, as opposed to rational belief and separated from the good works of a holy life, is the condition of Christian salvation. If faith does mean this, then we must say (as the judge did of grace), "What has faith to do with secular matters?" And faith must be turned out of court—where, however, by virtue of common sense and common language, we are taking all human means of promoting and rewarding good faith, and throwing discredit and disgrace upon the want of it.

The case is the same with the equally suitable and equally religious and beautiful term *grace*, which in its scriptural meaning is quite intelligible and has everything to do with worldly matters (or, at least, the more we let it have to do with them the better), but which has been narrowed and perverted by orthodoxy into something mysterious and unpractical (or bad in practice), and when presented in that condition, can only be contemptuously dismissed from our courts of justice and from every other scene of man's activity and duty.

But what does Paul say in the text about grace? He makes it to have no little to do with earthly matters; he makes it direct them in such a way as to fill them with heavenly goodness and peace. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works. These things speak, and exhort, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee."

Step by step let us see if grace, as thus described by the apostle Paul, has not something, aye everything, to do with earthly matters. *The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men.* What does the word grace itself mean? It is not a very uncommon word. We have it in other books besides the Bible, and use it in other conversations besides theological ones. Grace, gracious, gratify, gratitude, are all words of one derivation. They all speak of kindness done or kindness felt and acknowledged. The original meaning of the word grace is *kindness*—nothing more, nothing less. In older English it was indeed

more frequent in this sense than it is now. But what do you mean now by *finding grace* in a person's sight, *suing for grace*, doing a thing as *matter of grace?* What are *days of grace* in business contracts? What is an *act of grace* on the part of a sovereign? Kindness or favour is the meaning. Then, as everything kind is also loveable, grace comes to mean loveliness as well as kindness. And this in the Greek and Latin as well as the English. In modern English this meaning is perhaps more frequent than the other. In common English, grace means loveliness more often than kindness. The two are distinguished in the two adjectives *gracious* and *graceful*. *Gracious* means full of the grace of kindness, and *graceful*, of the grace of loveliness. To the older English of the Bible is chiefly entrusted the charge of retaining and refreshing the true and primary meaning of grace as kindness. The grace of God is the *kindness* of God—no more, no less. How large, how pure and loving, is the thought!

The grace of God is further described by the apostle under one of its leading acts of kindness as *bringing salvation*, the gospel deliverance from sin and woe, the salutary, saving precepts, promises and example of Jesus Christ; and it has appeared *to all men*, or for all men rather, making no difference between Jew and Gentile, but proclaiming blessings from God as impartially through the word of revealed grace as they are bestowed in the majestic economy of Divine Providence.

And how does this grace of God confer this important salvation? The text goes on: by *teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world.* Aye, in this present world, where a judge says what grace teaches has no concern, and where a foolish person who thinks himself a special subject of grace, believes himself exempted thereby from manly duty. What! is not this teaching of grace the very thing to make men good citizens and good jurors? How can more or better morality be put into so little compass? The doctrine of Christian grace teaches men to abstain from all wrong and to do all right; and the right is described under three heads, which comprehend respectively the personal, the social and the religious duties. It is *soberly* (with self-control), *righteously* (with social justice and kindness), and *godly* (with religious awe and love). And this doctrine of grace not only has to do with the present world and its earthly matters, but it repudiates and precludes the easy, fashionable distinction drawn so constantly, and admitted by our judge and juror, between earthly and heavenly duties, between this world and the next. It makes the true, manly and Christian life now to be the all-sufficient preparation for the life immortal. We are to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, *looking for the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.* And as if to make what is clear yet clearer, to make

the grace of God yet more gracious, the emphasis of his holy will and promise yet more emphatic, the mention of Jesus Christ personally leads the apostle to repeat that it was the work of his personal life and labours to effect that which the gracious kindness of the Almighty had contemplated in sending him. For he *gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works.* And does this grace of God forbid a child of grace to do the duties of a man and a citizen? Is this grace of God to be repudiated by the judge as having nothing to do with worldly matters? to be banished from an English court of justice? Oh! rather, judge and juror, all citizens, all good men! use these doctrines of grace as Paul bids Titus use them: "These things *speak*, and *exhort*, and rebuke with all authority. Let no man despise thee." No man can despise this apostolic doctrine of grace, nor despise the Christian who is made by its help a good man, a good relative, a good citizen and a good patriot, a good juror or judge. Grace thus defined most admirably becomes the judge himself, who ought to be in the highest, purest and most undogmatic sense, a really religious man, a Christian, a man filled with the grace of God, with the kindness, the gentleness, the tender religious goodness which knows how to temper justice with mercy. How gracefully were the grace of God illustrated in his decisions and his manners!

It cannot have been this doctrine of grace that really made our juror scruple to do his duty. What then did he mean? The phrase has, we all know, a narrow and very inappropriate meaning with a certain part of the religious world, who appropriate it to a certain set of doctrines, known as predestination, original sin, particular redemption, irresistible grace, and the perseverance of the saints. These are the five points of Calvinism, deemed by narrow souls the peculiar doctrines of grace, or saving doctrines; and to one of these the judge evidently alludes in his sarcastic reproof. Calvinism says that the grace of God consists in forming mankind utterly depraved and helpless, predestinating some of them to heavenly bliss and the rest to endless woe, in redeeming the elect by particular providences irresistibly moving them to an orthodox faith, and making it impossible that they shall finally fall away. How different from the grace of God described by the apostle! It does not appear *for all*, but for a few; does not save them *from sin* by teaching them holiness, but saves them from punishment by irresistible decree; does not *teach them to live* soberly, righteously and godly in the present world, in the blessed hope of another; but tempts them to despise God's works of creation and providence in the present, while indulging a morbid, unpractical, selfish belief in their personal election from amongst their condemned fellow-beings, perhaps friends and relatives.

By the juryman's quotation from our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, "That ye resist not evil," it might seem that he had something of the Quaker feeling against a Christian going to law. St. Paul himself discouraged the Corinthian Christians from carrying their disputes before heathen magistrates, and recommended mutual arbitration amongst themselves as preferable. But it is somewhat dull and irrational to erect these wise counsels for that particular time into principles of perpetual obligation incumbent upon Christians at all times. And it is very difficult by these or any other scriptural suggestions, to save this man from the imputation of "nonsense" with which he was so contemptuously dismissed from the jury-box.

In the theology of the juror and the observations of the judge upon it, we see the *correlative aspects* of the popular theology. In the former we have a religious man (for no doubt he is so, with somewhat strong convictions or feelings of his own) who, according to his view, is to be therefore a useless and impracticable man. In the remarks of the judge we see it admitted and laid down, that *religion has nothing to do with the common affairs of our secular life.* These two positions are perfectly consistent. The one is the result of the other. The fact is continually exhibited, though not in a bird's-eye view, as in this case. Religion is first made unpractical, and then it is repudiated from the practice of life. It is taken to be something else than the real life of a good man, and then even good men can say they have nothing to do with religion. Here is the case in both its parts.

Judge Bramwell is reputed to be not the most "religious" of the judges,—a distinction, again, which has reference, according to the common use of that term, to technical, artificial and conspicuous signs of religious partizanship, but not to the deeper religion of morals and duty. A clever epigram has appeared in the pages of our weekly humourist, hinting, in reference to his indignant question, what grace has to do with things below, that if he would go to church a little more,

"It's possible he'd know."

Now, in sober sadness, I doubt whether going to church (the Established Church of this country), and hearing and studying the doctrines of that church, would teach him what grace has to do with the things of this world in general and courts of justice in particular. This is precisely the gravamen of my charge against the established orthodoxy,—that the incident at Bristol is a genuine expression of the continual fact that the doctrines of grace, as generally expounded and generally understood, have nothing, and can have nothing, to do with secular affairs. If the judge were to study the doctrines of grace with the aid of the Articles of the Church of England, he would not find so much fault, after all, with the supposed Calvinism of the jury-

man. Whatever may be thought of the Popish character of the Liturgy and the Arminianism or latitudinarianism of the clergy, there is no doubt that the Articles of the Church of England are Calvinistic. The 10th Article says expressly, that in consequence of the fall of Adam, "we have no power to do good works pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will." The 13th Article says, that "works done before the grace of Christ and the inspiration of his Spirit are not pleasant to God; . . . yea rather . . . we doubt not but they have the nature of sin." The 11th Article says, "That we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." The 17th Article stoutly maintains Predestination and Election.

A judge who, as a devoted Churchman, believes all this, would still say it has nothing to do with his functions in a court of justice. He would not admit as a recommendation of mercy or plea for mitigation of damages, the doctrine of original sin or divine decree or irresistible grace. If these were sacred mysteries to him as a Churchman, they would be "nonsense" to him as a judge. He could not bring his doctrines of grace into action in his judicial mind. So I think the epigrammatist in *Punch* prescribes a very insufficient cure for the conspicuous evil when he proposes sending the judge to church. A different school of theology is necessary to harmonize the doctrines of divine grace with the duties of human courts of justice.

In the preaching of many clergymen of the Establishment, no doubt, the applicability of religion to common life is well enforced; but it is not by virtue of the Church of England "doctrines of grace." These may be set aside, forgotten, ignored. Often, thank God! they are set aside, forgotten or ignored; while Christian morals are preached instead, and the grace of God is set forth, as Paul himself sets it forth, as teaching men to deny ungodliness, and live soberly, righteously and piously in the present life, looking for the blessed hope of the life everlasting. But this, whenever and wherever it happens in "orthodox" churches so called, it must be observed, is done *in spite of* the orthodox creeds and symbols, not by virtue of them. It comes from that part of the Christian religion which is common to all good Christians, but which is not reckoned to belong to orthodox belief. The juryman and the judge are still the type of the usual unpracticality of those forms of religion which are called distinctively "orthodox," and of the consequent neglect and contempt of what are called the *religious life*, the *religious character*, and the *doctrines of grace*, by clear-headed and practical men of the world.

And we are told the Unitarian controversy is settled and done with; that doctrinal principles of religion have been sufficiently

vindicated and established; that Christians of all sects and parties are content (or may be) to meet on the common ground of devotion and practical morals. Would that it were so! But while a Humboldt is not deemed Christian because he loved the works of God better than the poor theologies of the Calvinistic or Lutheran Church, and while a judge in an English court of justice can declare that the doctrines of grace have nothing to do with worldly affairs, our work of maintaining the simplicity of the grace of God in the gospel of Jesus Christ is not completed nor superseded. We have still to bring a reasonable and a practical Christianity within the hearing of judges and senators, of educated men whose education includes all branches of knowledge except that of the so-called grace of God, which they only know to despise it. We have still to shew to our men of science that Christianity is not, as they have been led to suppose, a contradiction to the works of God in nature and providence, but that it illustrates His wisdom, truth and goodness, in ways the most congenial of all to the human soul. We have still to make these blessed truths vocal to the multitude of jurors and others who know no doctrines of grace but the ungracious creed of Calvin. We have to vindicate the Fatherly character of the Almighty, the simplicity of gospel truths, the purity of gospel morality, the practical use and blessedness of the Christian's faith and hope. We have to make it manifest (as no other professing Christians can or do) that a Christian is not less a man for his Christianity, but more; not less a citizen, not less a patriot, not less a philosopher, not less a lover and benefactor of his kind; but that all his human relations and duties are recognized by his religion, his best faculties called forth by it, all the good that is in him cherished, all the evil checked and rebuked, all the man made fit for God's spiritual blessing, all the life that he now lives in the flesh made worthy to become immortal in the spirit.

E. H. H.

ENGLAND'S GREATNESS.

Sooner or later our colonial empire must fall, in due time, when it has answered its ends. The wealth of our island may be diminished, but the strength of mind of the people cannot easily pass away; and our literature, our science and our arts, and the dignity of our nature, depend little upon our external relations. When we had fewer colonies than Genoa, we had Bacons and Shakspeares. The wealth and prosperity of the country are only the *comeliness* of the body, the fulness of the flesh and fat; but the spirit is independent of them; it requires only muscle, bone and nerve, for the true exercise of its functions. We cannot lose our liberty, because we cannot cease to *think;* and ten millions of people are not easily annihilated.—Sir H. Davy in 1807.

SUPPOSED LOSS OF THE TEN TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

An idea has been generally entertained that ten out of the twelve tribes of the Israelitish people were lost at the time of the Assyrian captivity, and have never since been discovered. But there are several considerations leading to the conclusion that this is a mistaken notion. And, first, there is a strong presumption arising from the remarkable circumstance of the twelve tribes being repeatedly mentioned or referred to in various passages of the New Testament, with an apparent or rather evident unconsciousness on the part of the speakers or writers that their entire existence was at that time even questioned. The apostle James addresses his Epistle expressly "to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad." In the apostle Paul's celebrated speech before king Agrippa, who was himself a Jew, and "expert in all customs and questions among the Jews," he is confidently appealed to on "the hope of the promise made to the fathers;" "unto which promise," the apostle adds, "our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come." In the book of Revelation, ch. vii., all the twelve tribes are first mentioned and then separately enumerated. And Jesus himself, discoursing to his disciples of the power with which they should be invested in his future kingdom, describes it as "sitting on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

The question, then, is, What became of the ten tribes after their captivity by Shalmaneser, king of Assyria? and how were they so re-united with the other two tribes as to be thus unhesitatingly and invariably spoken of as forming with them one people? And this question may, I think, be satisfactorily answered by attending to and comparing the facts of the case as derived from different sources of information.

"When the Assyrians led the ten tribes into captivity, they probably took away only the higher class of people, and did not depopulate the whole country; in the same way as the Babylonians did with those of Judea at the time of the Babylonish captivity, who left of the poor of the land (always the largest class) to be vinedressers and husbandmen. Besides which, during the course of more than two centuries, and particularly after the subversion of the Assyrian empire, many exiles, or descendants of exiles, may have found their way back to their native land. The same event would contribute to the dispersion of others into different countries, where they might meet and unite with those Jews who at the end of the Babylonish captivity did not return to Judea.

"The dispersion of the Jews over the world, which is commonly dated from the destruction of Jerusalem, had in reality begun long before. And when this length of time during which it had been going on, and the vast variety of countries into which

they were dispersed, is considered, it seems impossible to believe that the multitudes thus scattered over the face of the earth should have been the descendants of the two tribes only. The Ptolemies had transplanted large colonies of them into Egypt, Cyrene and Cyprus. And Antiochus the Great settled great numbers in the towns of Asia. In the time of Cicero there was a wealthy Jewish community in Italy. A passage of Philo enumerates the countries in which the Jews were settled in the time of Caligula,—Egypt, Syria, Pamphylia, Cilicia, the greatest part of Asia Minor as far as Bithynia, the shores of the Euxine, Macedonia, Thessaly, Ætolia, Attica, the Peloponnesus, Cyprus and Crete, besides the countries beyond the Euphrates."

In striking accordance with these accounts is the description given of the numbers collected together at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost: "There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven, Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia and in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians." And the apostle Peter addresses his First Epistle to "the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia."

Again, the Samaritans always claimed to be of Israelitish descent. And that this claim was by no means unfounded will appear from several considerations. When the separation of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin from the other ten tribes took place, the latter retained the name of the kingdom of Israel, which had first Sichem and afterwards Samaria for its capital. The Samaritan characters are the old Hebrew characters, which were disused by the Jews during the Babylonish captivity, but retained by the Samaritans, and are used in the extant copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch. When the Jews, after the seventy years' captivity, were allowed by Cyrus to return to their own country, and began to rebuild their temple, the Samaritans requested that they might share in the work, pleading that they were fellow-worshipers. The building of the temple on Gerizim seems to have put a final stop to the remains of idolatry among the Samaritans. They expected a Messiah, and it is remarkable that their notions of his office were more correct than those of the Jews.

I think, considering all that has been above stated, and, most of all, taking into account the very remarkable passages in the New Testament first referred to, it is scarcely possible to avoid arriving at the conclusion that the ten tribes were gradually re-united to the others, and now, blended together, constitute the great body of the Jewish people, scattered over various parts of the world, and thus verify the prophecies of their dispersion and preservation.

R. L.

MR. MARTINEAU'S RECENT LETTER ON THE UNITARIAN POSITION.

Mr. Martineau has recently published a letter, entitled, "On the Unitarian Position," on which we are induced by various considerations to offer some remarks. And first of all, in justice to Mr. Martineau, we reprint from the *Inquirer* of Aug. 27th the letter itself. We need for this proceeding offer no apology to our contemporary, as the letter is a comment on an article which first saw the light of publicity in our pages.* A reprint of the article, circulated by its author, Mr. S. F. Macdonald, the late minister of Chester, on the occasion of the meeting in that city of the Provincial Assembly, gave Mr. Martineau the opportunity of this elaborate comment, addressed to the author of the article:

Dear Sir,—I have received and read with much interest the tract on the "Unitarian Position" which you have been kind enough to send me. With many of its statements of principle I find myself in hearty accord; and even where I cannot entirely concur in your conclusions, you so far carry my sympathy with you by the spirit and aim with which they are recommended, that I feel impelled to explain to you—as in self-defence—the grounds of my partial dissent.

And first, let me disclaim in the most emphatic manner the sentiment which, quite erroneously as I believe, you impute to some among us,—of objection to well-defined and distinctly-taught opinions in matters of theology. With every earnest and thoughtful man it is a spiritual necessity to establish himself in clear and positive religious convictions, and an imperative duty to give them simple and open expression in his worship and his life. In every Christian congregation there must be, as the ground of its internal union and external action, a fundamental agreement for the time being—among themselves and with their minister—as to the main features of Christian doctrine, as well as the essentials of Christian life; and the unreserved preaching of these is no less obligatory upon the society than the private profession of them upon the individual. Still further, it is incumbent on the wider aggregates of persons scattered over the area of a province or a country, and united in earnest theological conviction, to combine together for the teaching and vindication of what they believe to be true, by the press, the pulpit, the missionary, and all similar agencies. On these points I never heard of any one who entertained a doubt; nor am I aware of a single sentence ever uttered or written by any one of our ministers or laymen which gives even the faintest colour to the imputation of indifference to definite thought, unreserved expression, and public union in relation to theological opinion.

The real question is this,—whether Theological combinations and Church combinations should be identical or distinct? If the sympathies and admirations and persuasions which make men of one school of theology are, in the long run, the same which group them into one Church

* See Christian Reformer, Vol. XIV., pp. 719—728.

fellowship and constitute their historical unity,—then undoubtedly the intellectual theory and the spiritual bond coalesce. And in all Churches whose very "scheme of redemption" is dogmatic, in which the salvation of mankind from a pre-existent curse and certain perdition, and their actual deliverance from the power of sin, are made conditional on belief in a given system of doctrines, there is a hopeless interweaving of theology with the spiritual life. With *them* it is quite true that if you alter the doctrine you alter the Church; and to them it seems absurd to recognize as of the same communion a believer not holding their distinctive characteristics. The logical classification and the spiritual classification are with them necessarily the same.

This, however, is the consequence of precisely that notion of *orthodoxy* which we are in the habit of regarding with just dislike, and for which we substitute the more generous recognition of a *Progressive Theology amid sameness of Spiritual Relations.* The consequence is simple and obvious. It is the conscious sameness of spiritual relations that constitutes *a Church;* it is the temporary concurrence in theological opinion that embodies itself in a creed and makes *a Sect* in the proper sense. The very life and soul of the former, so far as we are concerned, is in the feeling and proclamation of unity in spite of difference. The essence of the latter is in the accentuation of difference amid unity—in the imitative acceptance of the very principle and mode of thought whence other sects arise. We are bound, I must think, to hold our particular form of *personal opinion* on a different tenure from the *spiritual affections* which bring successive generations to kneel in our churches; to treat the former as a life interest, the latter as a freehold in perpetuity; and to beware of fixing upon worshiping assemblies and an ecclesiastical body whose life runs on through centuries, the mutable types of thought special to our own time. But such inadvertence we do assuredly commit the moment we attach a doctrinal epithet, be it "Unitarian" or be it "Trinitarian," to the Church of which we are members. Observe what consequences are involved, if once we admit that the defining essence of our Church is the Unitarian doctrine which the last century has worked out into prominence. In that case, we are essentially cut off as a Church from identity with the very body of persons that built and in many instances endowed our places of worship, and from whom, as the family tombstones attest, most of us are descended. Upon what ground, for instance, can you claim a rightful succession, as you have so nobly done, to Matthew Henry and the founders of Crook Street, if you place the *essence* of *your Church* in doctrines which *he did not hold?* When our religious properties were attacked some years ago, precisely upon this ground, that our essence was Unitarianism and the founders' certainly was not, what was our defence? We denied the allegation, and pleaded that the distinction of *us both* was one and the same, viz., the maintenance of a catholic Christianity and open theology as against any fixity of doctrine in this type or in that; and we appealed with special pride to the Salter's-Hall meeting, at which a majority in an open assembly, almost exclusively Trinitarian, refused to declare theirs a Trinitarian Church. What right have we to claim affinity with that example, and celebrate it among the glories of our liberal ancestry, if in our own persons we reverse it, and abuse the latitude they left us to its own destruction,—establishing the Church which they bequeathed us on the

negation of a doctrine which they believed, yet would not make their ground of union? Our whole inheritance from the past is bound up with the condition, that we are *not* to plant ourselves as a Church on a dogmatic foundation; and it is surely the grossest inconsistency—our opponents must think it hypocrisy—at once to applaud and destroy the latitude of principle which is traditional amongst us.

So conscious were our leading men of this at the time of the attack upon our chapels, that they at once saw the unfitness of what seemed to be the natural organ of representation and defence—I mean the Unitarian Association—to act at all on our behalf. How could an organization, with a doctrinal name upon its face, go into court and plead our right to our chapels on the ground of their doctrinal neutrality? Accordingly *another* Association had to be got up specially for the purpose,—the English Presbyterian Association,—in order to evade the inconsistency. And I know it to have been the opinion of the two founders of the Unitarian Association (the late Mr. Aspland and Mr. Edgar Taylor) that they committed a disastrous mistake in giving a doctrinal name to the Society; and that, the error being discovered, it would be doubling the wrong to make the Association in any sense the representative organ of our body. I have this in Mr. Edgar Taylor's own handwriting. He was for letting the Association subside into a body of *individuals* interested in the propagation of Unitarianism, like a combination for the diffusion of peace or temperance ideas; but for trusting to other and broader agencies to express and sustain the natural affinities of our Churches. I confess myself of quite the same mind. To a Unitarian *Society*,—just as to a Reform Society,—I would willingly belong, but of a "Unitarian Church" I could never be a member; and I lament to find myself more and more excluded from the sympathies and associations that are dearest to me by the degeneracy of our catholic Nonconformity, with its self-defensive piety, into the noisy egotism of the sects.

You speak, and with great truth, of the long line of believers, in Unitarian doctrine traceable from the present hour up to the early ages of Christendom; and you justly say that in your view they form one communion with us, and are our spiritual ancestry. The negative side of this truth is, that their ecclesiastical opposites do *not* form, in the same sense and degree, one communion with us, and are out of the line of our spiritual ancestry. Now it seems to me impossible, without a most perverse reading of ecclesiastical history and literature, to adjust one's sympathies to this arrangement. I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor my moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects, or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians, all seem to me to contrast unfavourably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity. I am conscious that my deepest obligations, as a learner from others, are in almost every department to writers not of my own creed. In Philosophy I have had to unlearn most that I had imbibed from my early text-books and the authors in chief favour with them. In Biblical Interpretation, I derive from Calvin and Whitby the help that fails me in Crell and Belsham. In Devotional Literature and Religious Thought, I find nothing of ours that does not pale before Augustine, Tauler and Pascal. And in the Poetry of the Church it is the Latin or the German hymns, or the lines

of Charles Wesley, or of Keble, that fasten on my memory and heart, and make all else seem poor and cold. I cannot help this. I can only say, I am sure it is no perversity; and I believe the preference is founded in reason and nature, and is already widely spread amongst us. A man's "Church" must be the home of whatever he most deeply loves, trusts, admires and reveres,—of whatever most divinely expresses the essential meaning of the Christian faith and life; and to be torn away from the great company I have named, and transferred to the ranks which command a far fainter allegiance, is an unnatural, and for me an inadmissible fate. That I find myself in intellectual accordance with the Socini, or Blandrata, or Servetus, in one cardinal doctrine,—and that a doctrine not distinctively Christian, but belonging also to Judaism, to Islam, and to simple Deism,—is as nothing compared with the intense response wrung from me by some of Luther's readings of St. Paul, and by his favourite book, the "Theologia Germanica."

So much as to one's spiritual relationship with the past. Then in regard to the future, you disclaim—and I well know how sincerely—any idea of putting dogmatic bonds upon our successors. Yet surely, if we make the Unitarian doctrine the essence of our Church, a congregation or minister cannot depart from that doctrine without forfeiting membership of that Church and having to seek a new ecclesiastical domiciliation; and this is precisely what we mean by Church exclusiveness and a closed theology. It is all that a Church can do, by way of limiting development, to say, if you quit such and such a form of Christian doctrine, you must leave us; and it is precisely what our predecessors refused to do. The habitual use of a doctrinal designation applied to a worshiping society, or to any group of such societies, its employment in public documents (such as petitions to Parliament) proceeding from the body, cannot fail, even in the absence of limiting conditions in the trust-deeds, to fix a certain stereotyped character upon the body, and to mask any wider latitude which its legal constitution may really possess. This alone is enough to check the spontaneous course of gradual change, to which surely the conservatism of reverential prepossession presents sufficient natural resistance. But it is idle to suppose that a "Unitarian Church," no more decidedly averse to a creed than you are, will abstain from expressly constituting its new congregations on a dogmatic basis, and introducing, as is the case with a few of our existing chapels, the name of "Unitarian" into its trust-deeds; and it cannot be denied that this tying up of property by doctrine *is* to attach a penalty to future change, and to reverse the usage by which we have inherited from the past.

Another evil incident to the naming of a Church from a dogma is this. At different times, and in different places, the several elements of a doctrinal system will possess a very different relative importance. Errors virulent in one country may be dormant in another, and truths which are primary in the life of one age may be quite secondary in another. If the first earnest revolt from some false or partial conception is permitted to shape itself into a church, the consequence inevitably is, that when the corrective testimony has been duly delivered, the antithesis which provoked it gets softened, and the interest in it declines; the mind of a new generation passes on to other and less exhausted themes, and in dealing with its own living problems is apt to find the pledges

of the antecedent period a mere dead weight of anachronism. Is it possible, for instance, to deny that the relative importance of the Unitarian controversy has materially declined within the last half century? Better insight into the origin and meaning of the Trinitarian scheme, more philosophical appreciation of its leading terms,—Substance, Personality, Nature, &c.,—and more sympathetic approach to the minds of living believers in it, have greatly modified our estimates, and disinclined many of us to make the rejection of the doctrine, any more than its acceptance, a condition of church communion. Where it is totally divorced, as it is generally on the Continent, and with all the newer phases of belief in and out of the English Church, from all ideas of birth-sin, of satisfaction, of election, of endless punishment,—where it is reduced to a personal blending of the Godhead with our humanity, and applied to intensify the glory of self-sacrifice,—it leaves for some of the noblest of our men and women a larger ground of sympathy with it than the sort of miraculously-confirmed Deism which often passes under the Unitarian name. In this way, real and living concords break through the lines of nominal and comparatively formal classification. And interval of space has the same effect in this respect as change of time. In America, Unitarian doctrine has been worked out indirectly from several starting points, different from each other and from ours. By your rule they fall under the same ecclesiastical category with ourselves and with the Boston Unitarians. Yet practically, the spiritual affinity uniting us to them is far less genuine and close than we feel for other bodies of Christians of whom we cannot predicate our doctrinal name. So on the Continent, there are Protestants of rising eminence and influence in France, in Belgium, in Germany, who, it is well known, would fall under your definition of our Church. Yet they decline to identify themselves with us; and Athanase Coquerel, partly from this feeling, refused to preach before the Unitarian Association a few months ago. They do not like our narrow theological position; the doctrine we put forth as chief is to them but secondary. Their minds are engaged on other and more comprehensive questions; their eye is on the future, while we are clinging to the past. I am persuaded that if the natural sympathies of the present age are to have way, and the liberal, thoughtful, earnest-minded Christians of our own and other countries are to be brought into any mutual understanding, it must be through some other agencies than the word "Unitarian" and that which it represents. Depend upon it, it no longer answers to the real, essential, living groupings of our time. As private persons, let you and me and others, by all means, bear it wherever there is occasion to mark as ours the particular opinion which it designates. But let us not attempt to force that opinion into a relative position which it cannot make good, much less to stamp it into the essence of a Nonconformist body, whose past we thus obliterate, and whose future we restrict.

You will probably ask me, what distinctive name I would substitute for the doctrinal one? Were it particularly desirable to assume an invariable distinctive name, it would not, I think, be impossible to find one. Distinction, however, is precisely what others indeed, from their point of view, may be anxious to impose upon us; but what we should not be anxious to assume for ourselves. Our attitude ought to be just what the attitude of our founders was. "We are no sect going aside

out of zeal for some fraction of doctrine to make a new and pet church of our own. We wish to stay with you, our brethren in Christ, only you will not let us; you have artifices of metaphysic by which you narrow the way of life. Our conscience cannot pass, and must seek her God alone, till you take the hindrance away, or come over to be with us where no hindrance is." Of a body that speaks thus the *differentia* is, *to have no differentia;* and therefore to eschew for itself any distinctive name, unless it be one that holds up to view its openness and catholicity. Had we a representative organization, it might be important to have such a collective name. But so long as we have to speak chiefly of individual congregations, or of the body (as on occasion of addressing the Throne) in its historical character, I am of opinion that local, accidental, traditional names, varying even at different places or times, are intrinsically preferable to precise and logical designations. If a body is to run through a long historical development, it is impossible to seize its true idea *a priori;* its essence is always coming out; and, to correspond with the reality, the name must be flexible and expansive, and must shun a precision true for to-day, but false for yesterday and to-morrow. Not being anxious to form a sect, but only, till better days, to keep open and unexclusive some little corner in the Church meant to be Universal, I am quite content with a stock of provisional and accidental names. The mere fact that we inherit no other expresses the very genius of the large-hearted and self-renouncing Christianity from which we spring.

I must entreat your forgiveness, my dear Sir, for this long infliction, far longer than I at all intended when I began. The subject has a certain melancholy interest for me; for the spirit of the time gives little encouragement to discuss it. The Unitarian Association having recently done me the honour to offer me the chair at their annual meeting, I thought it my duty, in declining, to explain the precise extent to which I could identify myself with their action; and to invite attention to the question, Whether their basis might not be advantageously enlarged? As this letter elicited no response, I suppose it was thought unadvisable to open the question which it raised; and Mr. Edgar Taylor's remark comes true, that it is vain to look to the Association itself for any reform of its own basis. Your pamphlet revived the train of thought, and made me long once more for some better life than our churches seem likely to attain. So I have visited my vain aspirations upon you.

I remain, my dear Sir, very truly yours,

JAMES MARTINEAU.

Castletown of Braemar, Aberdeenshire,
August 6th, 1859.

This letter has excited among Unitarians all the attention which is rightfully due to the deliberately-formed opinions (and such we of course judge them to be) of one who, in addition to being an author of universally acknowledged power, shares with his excellent colleague one of the two principal Unitarian pulpits of the metropolis, and also the Professorial conduct of Manchester New College. Such a letter as this, coming from any Unitarian minister, would have at once received a large amount of attention. Bearing as it does the authoritative name

of Mr. Martineau, it is a document of considerable importance in the history of English Unitarianism. We are compelled to add that it has given surprise and pain to many who, valuing their Unitarian profession, would gladly welcome and support Mr. Martineau as one marked out by his position and his remarkable talents to be a cherished leader and trusted counsellor of the denomination. If such a man seems to go wrong, it is important that what are regarded as his errors should be calmly pointed out, and that the responsibility of his statements should not extend to the religious body with which the world naturally deems him to be closely identified.

On some points we rejoice to find ourselves in entire agreement with Mr. Martineau; such, for instance, as the necessity of well-defined and distinctive theological opinions,—the importance of individual positive religious convictions, and their open expression in worship, in controversy and in life,—the propriety of a fundamental agreement between the members and minister of a religious society as to Christian doctrine,—and the duty of forming wider associations for the propagation of distinctive doctrinal opinions. It would scarcely be possible for opinions on these important subjects to be more clearly expressed than we find them in this letter. When, however, Mr. Martineau comes to apply the principles on which we seem to be in perfect accord with him, we unfortunately find him at the widest divergence from ourselves and those with whom we habitually act. We confess at once that we are totally unable to reconcile many of the latter portions of the letter with the large and satisfactory admissions with which it begins.

The main question to which Mr. Martineau addresses himself is, whether theological and church combinations ought to be identical or distinct. He declares that they should be distinct, and therefore he opposes and would abandon the use of the term Unitarian in connection with our churches. Mr. Martineau's argument is, that whatever importance may attach to the doctrine of the Unity of God, it is only one of several elements of religious thought and feeling, and that on other points we may be essentially at one with those from whom on the subject of the Unity of God we dissent. This is in itself perfectly true; but the application of it in Mr. Martineau's argument involves, in our judgment, a very one-sided view of the essential question at issue. There are many duties the faithful discharge of which is often painful to individual feeling, but which are duties still, and cannot be violated without disregard to the dictates of conscience and the obligations of truth. In his conduct of the argument, Mr. Martineau strangely fails to touch on the subject of worship, and on the question—a vital one as regards the rights of individual judgment and the foundations of dissent, or rather, we should say, a question vitally affecting the truthfulness and fidelity of

those communications which man is privileged to hold with his Maker—of the possibility of the honest believer in Unitarian Christianity joining habitually and conscientiously in orthodox worship. The question as to the Being to whom prayer is to be addressed is not a mere intellectual question; it is a practical one, which meets us, if we intend our worship to be scriptural and conscientious, at the very outset. That question must be settled before we can unite in church fellowship and join in common devotions. Why does a disputant so singularly acute avoid entering on this essential part of his subject? From the beginning to the end, he fails to bring out in what the distinctive value of Unitarianism consists. The questions in dispute between the Unitarian and his "orthodox" fellow-christians necessarily affect the essential matter of religious worship and the whole philosophy of Christianity. However strongly we may desire catholicity, these considerations compel us to preserve an attitude of separation from others on the ground of our Unitarian belief. And this must be the case on whatever basis we determine to found our association. It must be so even though, with Mr. Martineau and others, we accept Christianity, and not Unitarianism, as the basis of our church union. The practical questions we have to deal with are different from the theoretical ones,—necessarily made different by existing controversies. The separating position we take is something added to the mere assertion of the principle on which as Christians we rest; but the addition is one which conscience and consistency compel us to adopt. So far from violating the foundation principle referred to, we virtually carry it out by making this additional contribution to Christian fidelity. We have no choice in this matter; we are bound to act as we do by simple regard to truth and righteousness. This view of the subject, an essential element of the Unitarian position, Mr. Martineau fails to notice. When a writer omits matters so essential to the right understanding of the case, little reliance, we think, can be placed on his opinions. So long as he treats the difference between the Unitarian and the Trinitarian worshiper as one merely of opinion, as that which may be confined to the department of mere intellectual varieties, his conclusions must be rejected as violating the essential principles of moral obligation and human duty.

On another point Mr. Martineau appears to us to be theologically inaccurate. Is he justified in his separation of the Trinitarian scheme from the doctrine of satisfaction? The separation cannot be logically made, and would not be professed if those who professed it were free to discard the whole system of which satisfaction is a part. The Trinity is believed because it is thought that there is in the plan of redemption something that requires the concurrent agency of the three Persons by which a Trinity is constituted. That something is the work of satisfac-

tion. The Trinity most naturally connects itself with that; and supposing that to be put aside, something else of the same kind must be found to justify the Trinitarian belief. The *self-sacrifice* of the Godhead is what, according to Mr. Martineau, may be innocuously put in its place; but that theory is just as obnoxious to the charge of humanizing the Deity as the doctrine of satisfaction is.

Mr. Martineau thinks that the relative importance of the Unitarian controversy has during the last half century materially declined. We cannot assent to this conclusion. On what does it rest? In part, on certain metaphysical discoveries respecting the meaning of the words Substance, Personality, Nature. We do not doubt the power of metaphysical subtlety to give such representations on these matters as may make ordinary men confused and perplexed with regard to what is truth and what is error. But happily the mass of mankind have a better guide to truth than metaphysical subtlety, and to them it will appear a most important question whether the God whom they adore is simply One, or that metaphysical invention which our Unitarian ancestors honestly and wisely condemned and rejected, a Trinity in Unity. If the better notions to which Mr. Martineau alludes have reached the minds of the more eminent professors of Trinitarianism, and he concludes that it is of little use carrying on the contest any further with them, because they have virtually given in, and now rest in a mere nominal Trinity, some new metaphysical hash of the old Sabellianism,—we again say we demur to his conclusion. That they have *almost* won the victory, is to true soldiers of Christ a reason for fighting the battle bravely out. Our present position suggests motives in abundance for honest satisfaction and steady adherence to principle, none for abandoning that for which we have long contended, and adopting instead the system of compromise which we have long censured in our opponents, and which their leaders would seem in very shame to be now almost driven to relinquish. Let us look at the pitiable shifts, the incredible intellectual delusions, which men both clever and good are practising on their own understandings in order to save their conscience. When we, for instance, hear of ministers of the English Church apologizing for the retention of the Athanasian Creed because it is a symbol which enforces charity and rebukes a dogmatizing spirit, we know that the work which as Unitarians we aim at is partly, but still most imperfectly, accomplished; and we are cheered to greater effort by the desire of rescuing the intellect and conscience of good men from such discreditable delusions. But the number of those whose Trinitarianism is modified by their philosophy is in reality too small to justify, even if such modification ought to justify, a relaxation of Unitarian zeal. The mass of the religious world are unconscious of the lights of philosophical truth, and cling to

their old symbols of doctrine without distrust or doubt. The desire of teaching them a purer gospel, and of infusing into their hearts a more charitable spirit than "orthodoxy" commonly infuses, should animate Unitarians to arise and do their allotted work in the gospel harvest-field, not with less but with greater resolution.

One characteristic of Mr. Martineau's letter which much pains us is the very remarkable way in which he seems to shut Unitarians (as such) out of his sympathies. To others he is tolerant and apologetic; to us, who might regard ourselves as having some claim on his kind feelings, but are at least entitled to equal fairness, he is harsh, nay unjust. Is this an illustration of his *catholicity?* A thoughtful friend, writing on the subject, remarks—"I approve of the professed purpose of Mr. Martineau's argument. This approval, however, leads me to object the more and not the less strongly to the manner in which the letter disparages Unitarianism. I am sure the argument did not require this disparagement. I believe that it would have been more conclusive for the purpose stated if it had been accompanied by an estimate of Unitarianism at its highest value." Have not Unitarians already sufficient discouragements and obstacles in their conscientious adherence to what they believe to be truth, that they are to be publicly rebuked by one bred in their midst, and advanced to the highest honours the denomination has the power of conferring? The mischief of Mr. Martineau's depreciating remarks is, that they are not of a kind to help us to correct faults that may in some quarters exist, but furnish by their sharpness of expression the very weapons which our orthodox opponents will find pleasure in using when they wish to assail and humble us. Backed by the name of their author, they will be supposed to need no other proof, but will be naturally accepted and received as the utterances of one whose position ought to ensure him full and accurate knowledge. It is then necessary that Unitarians should at once repudiate statements affecting the character of their faith which they do not regard as true. It will otherwise be of no use to question the accuracy of such statements when brought against us by an open adversary.

What more injurious description of Unitarianism could be penned than that it is a "sort of miraculously confirmed Deism"? Mr. Martineau means, we suppose, *Theism.* The words, though etymologically the same, have in ordinary use a very different signification. Deism is identified with the rejection of Christianity. Of course Mr. Martineau does not propose to hint a fault either in Unitarians professing Theism or in their acceptance of miraculous proofs. One of the least desirable forms in which Unitarianism can be professed is Deism *without the miracles.* The miracles of the New Testament are accepted by Unitarian Christians as proofs of the truth and illustrations of the nature of

Christianity. In this view, any statement which represents Unitarianism as a mere belief in God and in certain miracles confirmatory of his Deity, is defective and injurious.

There is a statement in the letter still more painful—that in which Mr. Martineau allows himself, for the sake of a rhetorical point, to speak of the doctrine of the Unity of God as "a doctrine not distinctively Christian, but belonging also to Judaism, to Islam and to simple Deism." That Jesus Christ taught the doctrine directly and indirectly, is of itself enough to stamp it in our estimation as a Christian doctrine. But will Mr. Martineau affirm that we hold the doctrine separate from our Christianity? A not uncommon formula of Unitarian doctrine is, "the one God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." Surely Mr. Martineau will acknowledge that this is distinct enough from Judaism, Islam or Deism. The objection strikes us as unworthy of a philosophical mind. It is one which would better become Exeter Hall than Manchester College. Is the doctrine of the Divine Unity the worse for being held by Jews, Turks and Deists? To this question the lover of catholicity can give but one answer. It may be asked, in reply to the objection, Are not Jews, Turks and Deists, the better for holding the doctrine? Is it not a species of bigotry to depreciate a good cause by discrediting its goodness through the errors of some of its adherents? Is it not the wiser and the more catholic part to give these adherents credit for the goodness in spite of their shortcomings and defects? By his depreciatory mode of speaking of the doctrine of the Divine Unity, Mr. Martineau has, we are compelled to think, appealed to common prejudice for the disparagement of a truth which he himself believes.

On the subject of uniting respect for our religious ancestors with the duty of familiarizing ourselves and, as far as we can, sympathizing with all classes of religious writers, we are probably as fargoing as Mr. Martineau. We honour the early Unitarians as wise, good and brave Christian confessors. We feel it matter of honest pride to belong to a genealogical line which includes names like the Socini, Biddle, Whiston, Lindsey, Price, Priestley, Belsham, Channing, Ware and Wellbeloved. But in tracing out this particular and specially rich branch of the genealogical tree, our sympathy is not exhausted. We claim to be the descendants also of the early Nonconformists, of the Puritans who preceded them, and of the Reformers who began the work (which yet remains to be completed) of purging religion from papal corruptions. Nor do we feel that our Unitarian name and profession interfere in any degree with our sympathizing with sincere and earnest Christians of every sect. As disciples of a common Master, though differing as to the meaning of some of his lessons, it is to us a pleasant thought that we have a common lineage with Catholic and Protestant, Episcopalian and Independent, Metho-

dist and Baptist. Not less earnestly than Mr. Martineau should we enjoin on the student to familiarize himself with the best writers of every religious denomination. From all some truth and wisdom may be gathered. But this is no new practice in the Unitarian church. The libraries of our ministers, so far as their means permit, generally include the best specimens of orthodox literature. Our own shelves contain the works of most of the great Anglican divines, and some of the best Catholic writers of England and France, and all the principal works of orthodox Nonconformist writers. Mr. Martineau's works have their place, with those of Mr. J. J. Tayler, nigh to Chillingworth, Baxter, Jeremy Taylor, Goodwin, Sherlock and Biddle.

While anxious to assert oneness of principle with Mr. Martineau on this point, we cannot but regret the mode in which he has in this letter expressed the sentiment. True catholicity will lead the student to cull with impartial and generous feeling what is good from all, and not to make the good he gets from orthodox writers an occasion for flouting and discrediting Unitarian writers. Mr. Martineau's desire to disclaim intellectual indebtedness to Unitarian writers and teachers, is a feeling with which few Unitarians as well taught as he will sympathize. He ought at least to thank them for the love and practice of intellectual freedom and the desire above all things of truth. If his instructors and models unconsciously taught him error, they furnished him at the same time with the moral desire and with the intellectual machinery for attaining truth. In yoking Whitby with Calvin as an antithesis to Belsham and Crellius, Mr. Martineau fails in his usual felicity of illustration. Whitby shook off and wrote against the Calvinism in which he had been trained. His mild and tolerant and catholic Protestantism was all in contrast to the uncompromising and fierce love of system that was the characteristic of Calvin. His interpretations of scripture will more frequently confirm than confute those of Crellius and Belsham; and of those which seem most to support the orthodox faith, he saw fit in his Last Thoughts to publish his deliberate renunciation. He pronounced ere he died the orthodox idea of the Trinity, "a thing impossible and full of gross absurdities." As to Mr. Martineau's putting himself at the feet of John Calvin, may we without impropriety be allowed to express some degree of incredulity? Calvin's philosophy was that necessarianism which Mr. Martineau now attacks root and branch. Calvin's theology was the most offensive collection in existence of all the doctrines of which in his several publications Mr. Martineau has expressed his disapproval. Of Calvin and his contemporaries, we may say, in the striking language of the late Mr. Hallam (who quotes Eichorn as an authority for the statement), "They belong no more to man, but to the worm, the moth and the spider. Their dark and ribbed backs, their

yellow leaves, their thousand folio pages, do not more repel us than the unprofitableness of their substance. Their prolixity, their barbarous style" (this is certainly not attributable to Calvin), "the perpetual recurrence, in many, of syllogistic forms, the reliance by way of proof on authorities that have been abjured, the temporary and partial disputes, which can be neither interesting nor always intelligible at present, must soon put an end to the activity of the most industrious scholar." What the same writer says of the coryphæi of the Reformation is, we believe, true of the writings of Calvin—they are probably "more quoted than read, more praised than appreciated," and they "serve little other purpose, at least in England, than to give an occasional air of erudition to a theological paragraph, or to supply its margin with a reference that few readers will verify." In respect to Crellius, even learned members of the Church of England have not thought as meanly as Mr. Martineau seems to do; for Dr. Thomas Lushington (tutor, amongst others, to Sir Thomas Browne) published, in 1646 and 1650, Expositions of the Epistles to the Hebrews and the Galatians, founded mainly on the Commentaries of Crellius. Under the head of the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum, Bishop Watson makes these pertinent observations: "'There is,' says Dr. Harwood, 'hardly a good criticism in all our modern expositors, Mr. Locke, Dr. Clarke, Dr. Benson, Dr. Taylor, Messrs. Peirce, Hallet and Dr. Sykes, but what is to be found in the Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum.' Dr. Harwood is not singular in this opinion; and if it be a true one, these books may be consulted with advantage by those who do not adopt the particular tenets of Socinus and the Unitarians as well as by those who do." But whatever literary judgment Mr. Martineau may form of the manner in which Crellius and Belsham interpret scripture, there can be no doubt whatever (judging again from his published works) that his theological conclusions harmonize substantially with theirs, and essentially differ from those of Calvin. We cannot help asking whether the homage offered to Calvin as a biblical interpreter is to be regarded as a specimen of the "progressive theology" of our church? Is the contemptuous estimate of our own writers, old and new, a realization of "sameness of spiritual relations"?

The taste for devotional literature ought to be catholic. In this interesting field all Christians may be fellow-labourers. From all we may gain instruction and help. But is there not a fallacy in the way in which Mr. Martineau makes use of the fact that orthodox churches are rich in devotional literature, much of which is pleasing and instructive to him and other reputed heretics? Does the fact prove more than that there is a large space common in devotional subjects to orthodox and heterodox? The devotional literature of orthodox writers is acceptable to men like Mr. Martineau, not because it expresses orthodoxy,

but in proportion to its avoidance of such expression. The most distinguished devotional writers are unquestionably *unorthodox*, in the latitudinarian sense of that term. The latitudinarian divines are the writers with whom (if we set the Unitarian controversy aside) Mr. Martineau ought to feel the closest sympathy; but to have admitted that would have destroyed the whole argument of his letter. It would then have appeared that a negative Unitarianism at the least had a great deal to do with the un-unitarian sympathy for which he pleads. But on this subject we can appeal from Mr. Martineau in controversy to Mr. Martineau in practice. In his admirable collection of "Hymns for the Christian Church and Home," we find orthodox and heterodox poets happily mingled. But the hymns are generally characterized by the absence of all distinctive orthodoxy. Nor is the proportion of Unitarian poets small, or the value of their contributions to our sacred poetry insignificant. To the first book, the only one we have had time to analyze, out of 190 hymns, 55 at least (many of the hymns are anonymous) may be traced to a Unitarian source. Considering the small numerical proportion Unitarians bear to the general church of Christ, this result may be regarded as not unsatisfactory.

There are in the letter some references to the Unitarian Association, and one or two statements which require explanation and modification.

That Society is simply an organization for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity. How liberal the spirit in which the Society was formed, is evinced by the absence of all definition, whether of Unitarianism or Christianity. To every man's conscience and good sense is it left to decide what is Unitarianism and what is Christianity, and, so far as membership of the Association goes, no one is compromised by another man's views of these subjects. The Association does not affect to be the representative organ of all our churches, but simply of those individuals and societies that approve of its objects. Any one holding Mr. Martineau's views on the matter may, while he declines to be congregationally associated with it, join it as an individual subscriber. He is, however, not entitled to object to the junction of congregations, the members of which do not participate in his objection to congregational action under the Unitarian name. It is the deliberate opinion of many Unitarians that they do not by this name forfeit their right to the Presbyterian name. They are, they believe, consistent with their Presbyterian position so long as they abstain from forcing on their students, professors, ministers, congregations and societies, a definite statement of religious belief. The refusal of a creed is not the rejection of all beliefs. These are indeed as much implied in the Presbyterian as in the Unitarian position.

It is, however, stated in this letter that the original founders

of the Society were made aware that they had committed a disastrous mistake in giving it a doctrinal name. This statement is made on the authority of the late Mr. Edgar Taylor. We have no means of diminishing its force so far as his opinion goes, and therefore it must stand for what it is worth. We have been promised, and we await with interest, the publication of the letters on which the statement rests. There are other founders of the Association living who do not plead guilty in this matter to the commission of a disastrous mistake. The statement is strengthened by the name of the late Mr. Aspland. Now without questioning what Mr. Edgar Taylor may have written or said, we are, we believe, in a position to assert that Mr. Aspland was to the close of his life an unhesitating supporter of the Association as he originally helped to frame it. He held office in it as a member of the Committee to the last, and he was its Secretary until the state of his health compelled him to resign the arduous duty. The members of his family are desirous that the public should be informed that they know not of his ever having wavered in his attachment to the Association or the principles upon which it was founded. Neither in his conversations nor in his letters are they aware of a single expression indicating his wish to have the constitution of the Society changed. It is probable enough, when contemplating the proceedings in Chancery growing out of the Hewley suit, that Mr. Aspland may have felt that the open Unitarianism of our ministers and congregations may have facilitated the work of the relators in putting on the legal screw. Any expressions of this nature merely will not justify Mr. Martineau's statement that Mr. Aspland felt he had been guilty of a disastrous mistake. And it is a remarkable fact that the English Presbyterian Union, which Mr. Aspland suggested and formed, with a view of strengthening the defenceless legal position of the English Presbyterians, took its origin with the Society the constitution of which is now represented as a disastrous mistake. Writing confidentially on the subject to his eldest son, Jan. 12, 1843, Mr. Aspland says,—"I have at length succeeded in forming an English Presbyterian Union on a large scale and better plan than before. I got the Unitarian Association Committee to originate the matter." (Memoir of Rev. R. Aspland, pp. 576, 577.) The words "better plan" refer, not to the Unitarian, but to a previously formed Presbyterian Association.

Mr. Aspland devoted his energies throughout his public life to professedly *Unitarian* objects, and his family strongly feel that a statement imputing to him the acknowledgment of a disastrous mistake in this ought not to have been made on light grounds, nor without careful previous inquiry.

There are, in the letter on which we are remarking, such apparently contradictory views, that we know not with certainty whether Mr. Martineau makes it matter of objection that the

Association seeks to propagate Unitarian views of Christianity, or that it bears the name he so much dislikes of *Unitarian*. The founders of the Association had as their main object the support of Unitarianism, and they would have been wanting in candour if, with this deliberate purpose, they had assumed a name which concealed or which did not clearly express that purpose. Mr. Martineau seems to think it is distinction enough in respect to our chapels that they are called by the name of the street in which they chance to be built, although where, as sometimes happens, various places of worship are built in the same street, the name so derived ceases to be descriptive. Would he desire the Association to be called the "Essex-Street" or the "Strand" Association, because its rooms are or were situated in one of these localities? For our own part, we like to call things by their right names—*Unitarians we are, and we cherish the Unitarian name.* But if we may for a moment (notwithstanding all that in the latter part of the letter seems contradictory) accept in its literal and obvious sense the first part of Mr. Martineau's letter, which seems strongly to advocate "theological combinations" provided they be kept distinct from church ones, we may with propriety ask whether the Unitarian Association does not precisely fulfil his requirement in favour of "definite thought, unreserved expression and public union in relation to theological opinion"? If these purposes are to be disowned in church combinations, but to be fulfilled elsewhere, is not the Unitarian Association precisely such a "theological combination" as might have been expected to win his entire approval and support? We are, indeed, not able to reconcile Mr. Martineau with himself on this topic (whether through the want of clearness on his part or of acuteness on ours), for he says, "It is incumbent on the wider aggregates of persons scattered over the area of a province or a country, and united in earnest theological conviction, to combine together for the teaching and vindication of what they believe to be true, by the press, the pulpit, *the missionary and all similar agencies.*" But if the church (whether or not including the pulpit and the missionary) is to be kept free from theological distinctness, and another combination is to be sought for its expression, we cannot imagine anything that more entirely answers this requirement than the Unitarian Association. We try in vain to reconcile Mr. Martineau's dislike of the Unitarian Association with his distinction between theological and church combinations and his emphatic approval of each in turn.

There still remains an explanation to be offered of the anniversary arrangements attempted by the Committee of the Association, to which more than one reference appears in the letter.

It is stated that M. Athanase Coquerel declined to accept the invitation to preach before the Association partly from an unwillingness to identify himself with its doctrinal position; and this

statement is given in illustration of the supposed alienation from us of liberal foreign Protestants on account of our Unitarian name. What may be the sources of Mr. Martineau's information we know not; but it is due to the Committee to state that they have not made public either their application to M. Coquerel or the grounds of his declining. His reply, a most courteous and interesting document, does not support the statement made in Mr. Martineau's letter; for while alluding to supposed differences of doctrinal opinion, M. Coquerel says explicitly that he is most anxious the Committee should know that his refusal is wholly uninfluenced by considerations of this kind.

Again, Mr. Martineau refers to his own recent correspondence with the Committee. It is true that the Committee did solicit from Mr. Martineau the favour of his assistance as President of the last anniversary. They regarded him as the minister of a distinctively Unitarian church; they thought that some of his public declarations indicated a growing sympathy with Unitarian objects; and they were naturally anxious, in the anticipation of M. Coquerel's presence, to secure as their President a gentleman of Mr. Martineau's varied accomplishments and more than European reputation. They were not successful in their application, but the refusal was couched in terms of courtesy and kindness. Mr. Martineau says his letter "elicited no response." It would perhaps have been the right course for the Secretary to acknowledge and regret the decision announced. But the Committee had no right in their corporate capacity even to discuss Mr. Martineau's objection to the constitution of the Society. They were appointed solely to carry out certain prescribed objects, and they would have been untrue to their duty had they negociated with Mr. Martineau, or any one, for the alteration of the fundamental principles of their Association. If Mr. Martineau felt precluded by its existing organic laws from joining the Society, the Committee were, as such, precluded by the spirit of those laws from purchasing his support, however earnestly they desired it, by a promised change in the constitution.

In one respect the Committee of the Association will not have occasion to regret the publication of these facts, although it was never their intention to make them public. They will serve to shew that, however strongly attached to the Unitarian name and character, the Committee are really desirous of acting with others who, though agreeing with them on essential principles, decline to adopt their name.

In these remarks, extorted from us very reluctantly and under a sense of duty to the Unitarian body, we do not profess to have discussed the whole of the subjects opened with great ability in Mr. Martineau's letter. We have mainly directed our attention to points on which we fear the statements of the letter will lead to misapprehension and alienation of feeling both in and out of

the Unitarian body. It may be made to appear that we have not correctly apprehended Mr. Martineau's meaning and intention. We can only assure him that we would not intentionally misrepresent him, and that we shall receive not only willingly, but gratefully, any explanations which may make the letter less painful to those who think the support of Unitarian Christianity a religious duty, and one upon which no compromise ought to be made by those who hold its doctrines.

We may be wrong, but we fear that strangers reading Mr. Martineau's letter will imagine that the Unitarians are for the most part untrue to the principles and spirit of religious liberty. This we regard as an unreal picture. We value our Unitarian position because we know it to be one in which freedom is respected equally with truth. If it were otherwise, we must frankly say we should not care to continue for another day our public labours, but should be desirous at the earliest period of dissolving an alliance which under such circumstances could only produce disappointment. Because we believe the defence of the Unitarian cause to be a "noble task," we will not, spite of opposition from enemies however bitter, or disappointments from friends however painful,

> "Bate a jot
> Of heart or hope; but still bear up and steer
> Right onward."

If our natural standard-bearers decline to take their places in our ranks, we will, each man his own leader, fight the good fight and, if we can, win the victory. If we are exposed to defection and desertion, we will close up our ranks and contend the more earnestly for what we believe to be God's truth. And there is this consolation, that Unitarianism is strong independently of the numbers of those who profess it. It is strong in its compatibility with the common sense and generous feelings of human nature; it is strong in the proofs of its truth which are spread through the Scriptures, Old and New. If its strength were the mere result of sectarian combination, little heed would orthodoxy, with its numbers and its varied resources, take of it. Unitarianism is, however, formidable to every clergyman and every orthodox minister of religion, because, if not in his own personal studies and thoughts, yet in his pastoral walks and in his intercourse with those who read the Bible and think on religious doctrine with a single eye to truth, he finds Unitarian interpretations and ideas a frequent stumbling-block, and that too quite independently of the suggestions and counsels of persons bearing the Unitarian name.

MR. MADGE ON THE UNITARIAN POSITION AND NAME.

At a time when this subject is receiving a large amount of attention, it may be useful to reprint the admirable remarks of Rev. Thomas Madge, preached at Norwich, May 11, 1856, when he and the Rev. James Martineau were united as preachers in commemorating the 100th year of the Octagon chapel:

"Whether our churches are denominated free Christian churches, or whether they are designated by some other more marked and distinguished title, we still adhere to the great principle upon which this chapel was founded, and in conformity with which its services have been generally conducted. As a condition of membership no test is imposed upon any man. No confession of faith is required of him. He may worship with us,—he may commune with us at the Lord's Table without a single question being put to him as to what he believes, or what he does not believe. The largest liberty, consistent with any kind of order or any degree of Christian belief, is conceded to all who are desirous of joining our religious community. We say, in accordance with the language of Dr. Taylor, quoted by me in the beginning of this discourse, To every man who acknowledges Jesus to be the Christ, and who endeavours to frame his conduct in harmony with this acknowledgment, let the right hand of Christian fellowship be freely and gladly extended. He who wishes to enjoy in communion the faith, the hopes, and the charity of a Christian, should not be prevented from doing so by any law of man's imposing. If his heart condemn him not, then we are assured that he may have confidence towards God. And if it be otherwise, we have not been made rulers or judges over him; to his own Master he standeth or falleth.

"To all this it may perhaps be answered, Though you have no written creed to subscribe to, no particular confession of faith to make, still you cannot deny that you have certain beliefs in common, certain opinions relating to Christian doctrine and duty with which your sympathies are very much in unison; and do not these, in effect, amount to a creed? In one sense it must be acknowledged they do; but not in the sense which is ordinarily attached to the word. By a creed, in connection with the subject of religion, is usually understood a number of propositions drawn up by certain persons invested with no authority for the purpose, and partaking more or less of the colour and complexion of the minds from which they have proceeded. The belief of these propositions, with all their sharp definitions, is set forth as a necessary condition of Christian communion. Now this is very different from that implied understanding with one another among men who associate together as holding for the most part the same great general principles. It is impossible that any union or co-operation of Christians can take place without having some views in which they take a common interest; some opinions with which they largely sympathize. As is well observed by the Rev. J. J. Tayler in one of his excellent published discourses, 'There must be in a Christian church agreement respecting the object of worship, the sentiments and dispositions which are believed to be most acceptable to him, and the mode in which the feelings of love and reverence towards him should be outwardly and publicly expressed.'

And he further adds, 'All religious societies decline in which the spiritual consciousness is indistinct and weak,—when the preaching is confined to vague superficial generalities, with nothing marked and definite to indicate earnest conviction.'

"In assembling together, then, as Christian believers and Christian worshipers, it is needless to say that we must have some other object in view than the mere assertion and maintenance of the right of private judgment. That may be, and with us, very properly, is made an essential condition of our Christian union; but the end designed by this union is one of still higher significance and importance, to which the exercise of this right of individual judgment may be, and, it is hoped, often is largely conducive. Our meeting together, as on this day, implies the existence among us of some faith which we hold dear. It implies some faith in God, in the character and moral government of God, and in the nature and object of Christ's mission and ministry, in which we generally concur and to which we are more especially attached. Now it seems to be not an unfair question to ask, What is this faith? Under what category does it come? By what name may it be distinguished? Is it not what is commonly designated by the term Unitarian? In all honesty we must confess that, in conjunction with the word Christian, it is. I know that there are many among us who strongly object to this name. They object to it because it seems to them to contravene what I have before stated to be a great recognized principle in the constitution of our churches. But you cannot, by objecting to the name, get rid of the thing. You cannot set aside the fact as it is. As long as our worship is the worship of one only God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,—as long as we hold to the strict doctrine of the Divine Unity, the word Unitarian will be applied to us, whether we desire it or not; nor can we complain, while our worship is what it is, that it is either an unjust or an inappropriate appellation. I have no wish to do anything which should have the effect of restraining, in the slightest degree, our successors in this or in any of our chapels from professing whatever opinions, relating to Christian doctrine, they, in their honest judgment, may see reason to adopt. All I ask is, permission to call things by their right names; to apply to existing congregations the term which is best expressive of *their* faith, not to bind it upon those who may come after them. Let others do as they please. For my own part I willingly accept the name. It is not only the most correct, the most significant, but it is one of the most honourable by which we can be called. It denotes the leading doctrine of revealed religion—that doctrine which Moses and Christ have placed at the very head of the Commandments. It marks the opinions which have been entertained by some of the best, the wisest, and the noblest spirits that ever walked the earth; and it furnishes the only ground or basis on which a true genuine Catholic Church can be built. I am not however so wedded to a mere name as not to be willing to give it up, if it can be shown to stand in the way of that comprehensive union among Christians which we should rejoice to witness; but as it represents a truth without which no such union can take place, it appears to me not only that there is no sufficient reason for relinquishing it, but a manifest use and propriety in retaining it. That in so doing there is displayed nothing of the narrow spirit of Sectarianism; that there is nothing in it inconsistent with that

Christian freedom for which I have been contending as the rightful inheritance of every Church inscribed with the name of Christ, is evident from the fact that all Christians profess to believe in one God, the Creator of the universe, and the Father of men. All believe in man's immortality, that we are moral and accountable beings, and are destined to reap as we have sown. Thus far all are agreed. Why then should not our fellow-believers unite with us in a service based upon these few but all-important truths? They do not deny, they cannot deny, that the Being designated in Scripture as the Father, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is entitled to our highest homage and our profoundest adoration. Without any violation of their principles, therefore, they can join in devotional services framed upon the model laid down by our Saviour. There is nothing in point of conscience to prevent them from doing so. They cannot say that their prayers ought not to be addressed to the Being styled the Father. If they did, they could not join in the Lord's Prayer; for that, like our prayers, is addressed to the Father only. By their own admission, then, our worship is so far a Catholic worship; it is inclusive of all; it is exclusive of none. This cannot be said of Trinitarian worship. No consistent Unitarian can join in that worship. It necessarily excludes a considerable body of believers in Christ. It is not, like ours, general and comprehensive, and therefore not Catholic. I repeat, then, that the faith which distinguishes us as a Church is the common faith of Christians. It is expressive of the sentiments which make us all *one*, which bring us all in humility and dependence before the mercy-seat of Him who is the Father of all the families of the earth. But while we unite in the belief and acknowledgment of one only God as the object of our supreme adoration, and receive the instructions of Jesus Christ as the authorized revealer of His will, we not only do not exact anything like a uniformity of faith on other topics, but we expect and are prepared to find among ourselves a considerable diversity of opinion on many subjects of great interest and importance. So far from being displeased at the discovery of such differences among those associating together in the same Church, I would welcome it as bearing strong and explicit testimony to the true sound Catholic principles on which such a Church is established.

"I claim, then, for Unitarian Christianity, taken in its widest sense—the only sense in which it should be taken—the glory of being that form of Christianity under which alone all the followers of Christ can be brought to worship together in harmony and peace."

THE UNION OF SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

It happened that whilst one part of the world were enlightened by Religion, another part were left to Nature; and from this part proceeded the sciences; and from the union of the sciences with true religion in these latter times, everything grand, everything dignified, has arisen. *A great truth.*—Sir H. Davy.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. By SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. I.

"Unspotted from the world." Sweet words!
Mirror'd in them a life how blest!
Their silent loveliness records
Of "pure religion's" charms the best.

As the world's sadness, sin and shame,
Are in the rolls of time unfurl'd,
What triumph to be "pure" from blame—
To live "unspotted from the world"!

"Unspotted from the world"—whose stains
Hang o'er our cradles—track our race
Through all its penalties and pains,
And canopy our resting-place.

Thrice blessed who, while ages roll
On ages to oblivion hurl'd,
Keep the bright casket of the soul
Sacred—"unspotted from the world"!

No. II.

In our despair we ask, What can relieve us
From woe's oppressions and from misery's blight?
Rest to our souls the Saviour's staff will give us;
"His yoke is easy and his burthen light."

The world's delusive disappointments grieve us,
Hope's twilight darkening into clouded night:
Dawnings of bliss the Saviour's smiles may give us;
"His yoke is easy and his burthen light."

Pride will mislead, ambition will deceive us,
Friends may desert, and riches take their flight:
Peace, love and joy, the Saviour's words can give us;
"His yoke is easy and his burthen light."

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE REV. J. H. HUTTON'S RETIREMENT.

Sir,

The announcement of Mr. Hutton's resignation of his charge at Manchester, and the correspondence connected with it, form one of the most interesting articles in the current number of the Christian Reformer. It is especially interesting to me, recalling, as it does, the remembrance of a similar trial, though in a narrower circle and in a less conspicuous position, through which I had to pass some twenty years ago.

The separation of a minister from his flock is, however, hardly a subject for criticism in your pages; and I do not feel at liberty to remark upon it, or to express any other feeling than regret. But as you have introduced the article with some remarks, which seem to me open to exception, I am sure your usual candour and courtesy will allow me to say a few words upon these.

Mr. Hutton's retirement is simply, as it seems to me, a retirement from the ministry of the Upper Brook-Street congregation; but you call it a retirement from "the Unitarian ministry;" "regret his estrangement from the plain and simple doctrine of Unitarianism;" and "regard the deliberate adoption of the doctrine of the eternal personality of Jesus Christ as a disqualification of one whose duty it is to lead the devotions of a society of Unitarian Christians." You regard Mr. Hutton, then, as having abandoned Unitarianism, and as being disqualified for the Unitarian ministry. To me it seems that his retirement is local, and his disqualification, as yet, confined to his late congregation. The difference is a serious one, especially to those who, like myself, hold and avow doctrines not very different from those of Mr. Hutton. It behoves us, therefore, to test the soundness of your judgment, and to learn how far it represents that of the Unitarian body. Even though his exclusion should not involve ours, it touches us sufficiently near to excite our attention, and to arouse a natural desire to stand by him, if for no other purpose than to express our sympathy with him, when placed in a position of trial, for views which go but little beyond our own.

Mr. Hutton, according to your judgment, is not a Unitarian. What is he then? He says distinctly, "I am not a Trinitarian." I have been wont to regard the division of Christians into Unitarians and Trinitarians as all but exhaustive; but if it is not, will you describe the third class to which Mr. Hutton is relegated. If banished from our borders, what shall the land of his exile be?

Surely he is a Unitarian still; with peculiar notions if you please, but still one. You may make a distinct species of him, but he is comprehended in the genus. He says that he "cannot for a moment lose sight of the subordinate nature of the Son of God as a derived being;" he has "no desire to interfere with the simplicity of our present form or forms of religious worship;" but only seeks "to worship God through his Son Jesus Christ." Is not this Unitarianism?

Your judgment, after all, rests less upon his avowed opinions than upon what you deem to be involved in them. It is thus we are ever prone to argue, but with doubtful fairness. We charge upon others, not only the doctrines they hold, but also those which we think in con-

sistency they ought to hold. We impute to them not only the premises, which are theirs, but the conclusions, which are ours. You reason thus: "Eternity is one of the incommunicable attributes of God. We cannot see how the admission of Christ's eternity is to be separated from the worship of Christ as God." But Mr. Hutton does not hold that "eternity is incommunicable;" for he ascribes it to "a derived being," "of subordinate nature." You think this belief of Christ's eternity cannot be separated from his worship as God; but Mr. Hutton does separate them. Surely he is to be judged by his own reasonings, and not by yours.

This question of the communicable or incommunicable property of the attribute of eternity has recalled to my mind a passage I met with in bygone years, I think in the writings of Dr. Priestley.* The writer, speaking of the difficulty of supposing that the creation took place in time, since then there must have been a preceding eternity in which God was inactive, observes that perhaps the difficulty may be met by the supposition that, with God, existence and the exercise of creative power have always gone together. But if so, the creation must be eternal, and eternity is not an incommunicable attribute. I do not answer for the soundness of the writer's argument, for it seems to me to be applied to what is beyond the reach of our human logic. But I can see how, by it, eternity may be ascribed to that which is at once derived and subordinate. Of the process by which Mr. Hutton has attained to his present conclusions I say nothing, for I know nothing. I am only shewing that such conclusions may be attained without involving the ascription of divine attributes.

But you do more than argue; you prophesy. "To this practical conclusion (the worship of Christ as God) Mr. Hutton does not appear to have yet attained, but he is probably not far from it." Such prophecies sometimes fail. When (as I have intimated) a similar change of theological opinion separated me from an attached congregation, an old friend, whom you, Mr. Editor, as well as I, knew and respected in our early years, prophesied that I "should soon become a Calvinist." Twenty years have passed, and the prophecy still waits its fulfilment. Perhaps yours may fare no better.

Agreement, to a great extent, with Mr. Hutton's opinions, and hearty sympathy with him in the position in which those opinions have placed him, have led to this early and decided protest against your judgment.

Joseph Calrow Means.

P.S. Beside the agreement or close approximation which I have expressed to Mr. Hutton's opinion about Christ, let me add that I fully accord with his belief that, in missing those views, Unitarians lose a valuable source of religious life.

Grove Street, South Hackney, Sept. 11, 1859.

---

* Possibly in his *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion*, a work which in early life much interested me, and, I believe and am pleased to acknowledge, benefited me.

TESTAMENT *versus* COVENANT.

The September Number of the Christian Reformer, pp. 542—548, contains an interesting notice of a Revised Translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, but in it is expressed a decided preference for the word *Covenant* over the word *Testament*, as the title of the work. Without imitating the unamiable and censorious spirit which imputes stupidity and hints blasphemy on the part of those who would keep to the title, "The Old and New Testament," time-consecrated by a usage of upwards of fifteen hundred years,—I am prepared to contend that this ancient title is more descriptive of the Bible and more appropriate than that which has supplanted it in "a Revised Translation."

A *covenant* is a contract,—a document containing the terms of an agreement and reciting them in due order; but taken as a whole the Scriptures do not correspond to this definition; they are historical, didactic, devotional and prophetic, but, excepting some small portions, they are not a compact. St. Jerome, no mean judge of appropriate terms, among other reasons for applying the word *Testament* to the Old Scriptures, assigns the fact that "*Testamentum non voluntatem defunctorum sonat, sed pactum viventium*," an attested writing does not declare the will of the dead, but the agreement of the living. A *testament*, therefore, is not of necessity a "dying will," any more than an oration is a "dying speech;" it is simply a writing, the genuineness of which is witnessed either by the author or by other persons who are cognizant of its truth. The Scriptures of the old and new dispensations very closely answer this definition; they are the testimonies of religious men to the history and truths of revealed religion during the long ages which intervened from the creation to the establishment of the gospel of Christ; and the word Testament most appropriately denotes a collection of such testimonies,—the book in which they are registered and preserved.

Michaelis, Dr. Campbell, Mr. Wellbeloved and many others, contend that the Jewish and Christian Scriptures ought to be named "The Old and New Covenants;" and they are led to this by the word, *διαθήκη*, a setting forth of a plan or of the terms of a contract, which means sometimes "a mutual agreement on mutual promises or mutual conditions," and in the New Testament, "promises annexed to certain conditions." It may therefore denote the writing in which that agreement is contained, or the book in which those conditional promises are recorded; and very proper the term would be were the main part of the writing an agreement, and the great bulk of the book an enumeration of conditions and promises. But only a very small portion of the sacred writings is devoted to the methodical statement of stipulations and promises, and it is therefore a misnomer to designate those writings "The Old and New Covenants." And even if such a title were appropriate, it must be considered as an abbreviation; for, having regard to the fact that the sacred Scriptures are the documents which contain the covenants, the full designation of the volume would be, "*Veteris et novi fœderis Testamentum*," the Testament, i.e., the attested record of the old and new covenant.

I could imagine that the reviewer knew nothing of the force of the word Testament, excepting from an old quaint writer who speaks of the

duties of executors, and after accounting for the fact of wills being subjected to ecclesiastical jurisdiction, declares, "they are like that Testament of our Lord by which he bequeathed various valuable legacies to the human race, of which the clergy are the dispensers;" but we ought to rise above the narrow, insular, *patriotic* English meaning of the term, to that which is given to it by the Church Universal, and we shall then acknowledge its force, beauty and truth.

"A solemn league and covenant" bears its own meaning with it; it is a confederacy bound to pursue certain defined objects; but a covenant containing the history of the Jews and neighbouring nations for nearly four thousand years,—a covenant having inserted within its four borders the drama of Job, the epithalamium, the wise sayings and the preaching of Solomon, the noble devotional songs and anthems of David, and the richly poetic visions of Isaiah and the other prophets,—such a covenant is indeed a *convening*, a bringing together of very dissimilar elements; but it is not in its main features a contract of service and reward: the covenants are *in* the book, but the Bible is not a book of covenants either old or new.

The Greek title of the Christian Scriptures, διαθήκη, has two or three meanings: one, a compact or agreement; the other, a will to take effect after death; a third, any writing or document attested by witnesses; and such a writing is as much a testament as the solemn disposition of real and personal estate to be carried into force by executors and administrators. The reviewer tells us that διαθήκη has two meanings, but "has been translated by the wrong one." This supposed wrong translation is too confidently proclaimed; for not only can we trace up the translation, "*Testamentum*," as applied to the Jewish and Christian Scriptures, to the very beginning of the fourth century, but we can assign its use to an authority equal to Cicero himself for erudition and knowledge of the exact force of language. Lactantius, A.D. 301—318, knew that the sacred Scriptures were a collection of testimonies, of histories which testify to events, of laws and ordinances which testify to legislative authority, of prayers and holy thoughts which testify to religion in the heart, of prophets and evangelists who testify to the foreknowledge of God, and to the character and teaching of Christ; and he knew also, as well as any in the present day, by what Latin word correctly to define them. It is he who uses the phrase, "*Testamentum vetus et novum.*"

From his time downward, the same phrase has maintained its place; and, without any "profane absurdity" or "odd jumble of ideas," has been adopted as the title of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures by all the Latin and Teutonic races. France, Italy, Spain; Wiclif, Luther, Tindale, Cranmer, the Geneva Exiles, the College at Rheims, King James's translators,—all follow Lactantius and say, "The Old and New Testament." If there is any "profane absurdity," surely it is in supposing that the numbering of the twelve tribes, the genealogical tables in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and Ezekiel's description of the temple, its officers and services, are any portions of a covenant between God and the Israelities, or between Christ and his church. Surely it is as much "an odd jumble of ideas" to name the Bible a covenant, as it would be to name the Pictorial History of England a covenant, because it contains the compact between John and his barons, some account of

the Habeas Corpus and the Bill of Rights, and general notices of laws or covenants between the parliament and the ruling power.

Lactantius certainly made use of the word testament without the remotest idea that he was perverting it from its just acceptation, or that it denoted specially a document to take effect after the death of the testator. As descriptive of the general contents of the sacred writings, what title is more appropriate, forcible and true than this,—The Book of God's witnesses, The Book of Testimony, The Old and New Testament? "The things that have been heard among many witnesses were committed to faithful men who could teach others also;" and what they have taught and written is the Testament, the attested record of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ.

In applying an expressive and accurate title to the Scriptures, sound scholarship should have only the strongest reasons for departing from the authority of the early Fathers of the Church, and especially from that of Lactantius and St. Jerome, masters of language and well qualified for arriving at a right judgment. The *supplanting* word should at any rate cover a much greater portion of the contents of the book than the *rejected* word; but "covenant" has no such recommendation; it is essentially a narrow word, contracting but not expanding. Undoubtedly in such expressions as "This cup is the new testament in my blood," *covenant* is the more accurate translation, and ought to be adopted; but in fixing on a title for a large collection of multifarious writings, we must look at the entire work and not at isolated texts; and for the entire work the title handed down from ancient days is both more accurate and more comprehensive. Instead of changing the title, we should, if it needs the process (which in my mind it does not), explain and re-invigorate it; otherwise it will be said,

> "Men loven of propre kind newefangelnesse
> As briddes don, that men in cages fede."

Sept. 12, 1859. A Scripture Reader.

MOMENTARY DOUBTS.

A seditious rabble of doubts from time to time rise to dispute the empire of the understanding. Even where the mind, in its habitual states, is unconscious of any remaining doubt,—where it reposes in a vast preponderance of evidence in favour of this or that conclusion,—there may yet be * * * a momentary eclipse of that light in which the soul seemed to dwell; a momentary vibration of that judgment which we so often flattered ourselves was poised for ever. Yet this no more argues the want of habitual faith than the variations of the compass argue the severance of the connection between the magnet and the pole; or than the oscillations of the "rocking stone" argue that the solid mass can be heaved from its bed. A child may shake, but a giant cannot overturn it.—*Edinburgh Review* on Pascal.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Recollections by Samuel Rogers. Fcap. 8vo. Pp. 229. London—Longmans. 1859.

Although in some things this volume tantalizes and disappoints us, by just giving us a glimpse of good and bright thoughts and not permitting us to realize and enjoy them, we yet are ready to give it a cheerful welcome. Mr. Rogers was long one of the celebrities of English society. We dare not say that he was not in some aspects of his character the worse for the social homage which, for half a century nearly, he received in the circles both of literature and fashion; but we may well ask how many men would have borne it with as small an amount of moral injury as he did? Place him, for instance, by the side of another social lion of his own age, Thomas Moore, and does he not shine by comparison? They who look back upon the 19th (as we do with insatiable curiosity on the illustrious men of the 18th) century, will desire to know more than is directly told them of Samuel Rogers, a name they will meet with in so many pleasant paths. For their sake (and our own too) we should have been glad if, instead of editing this little book, well as he has done it, Mr. William Sharpe had prepared a full biography of his uncle, and had woven these Recollections into those portions of it which would have aimed to illustrate the social privileges of Mr. Rogers. However, we must be content, we suppose, with the slight sketch in the Preface.

"Samuel Rogers was born in the month of August, 1763, the third son of a London Banker, whose immediate ancestors were of a Worcestershire family, and members of the Church of England; while through his Mother he was descended from one of the Ejected Ministers of the reign of Charles the 2nd. It is, no doubt, to his maternal descent that he alludes in the following lines, introduced into the notes on the poem of Italy:

> 'What though his Ancestors, early or late,
> Were not ennobled by the breath of kings;
> Yet in his veins was running at his birth
> The blood of those most eminent of old
> For wisdom, virtue—those who would renounce
> The things of this world for their conscience' sake.'
> * * * * *

"From his Mother, who was taken from him in his early youth, and of whom he always spoke in terms of the greatest admiration and affection, he imbibed a love of the intrinsically good which guided him on many an after occasion. And in one of his elder Brothers, whom he lost soon after he attained to manhood, and to whose memory he addressed those beautiful lines in the first part of the Pleasures of Memory, beginning,

> 'Oh thou! with whom my heart was wont to share,
> From Reason's dawn, each pleasure and each care,'

he had an example of virtue and good sense which strengthened his character and by which he profited through life.

"His Father and Mother were Dissenters, and he was brought up in their persuasion; and always through life, when occasion required an expression on the subject, he described himself as a Presbyterian; though he never obtrusively put forward his opinions on religion, and often expressed himself as desirous of forgetting any little differences of creed, and of uniting with the virtuous of all sects and parties in one religion of Christian Love.

"It is well known that Mr. Rogers was in politics a Whig; but in choice

of friends he did not confine himself to any party; and from the time when he first became known as a writer, and entered much into society, associated most intimately with persons of all parties.

"Although introduced when very young into his Father's business, his love of poetry was shown early. Long before he was twenty he had put upon paper many lines which afforded promise of his subsequent performances. His first published poem, the 'Ode to Superstition,' was begun before he was of age; and the 'Pleasures of Memory' appeared while he was still a working partner in the Bank.

"Having lost his Father in 1793, whose death-bed he has touchingly alluded to in his 'Lines written in a Sick Chamber,' and having united with him in business his younger Brother Henry, he soon afterwards retired from all active management of the affairs of the Banking-house, and never resumed it. He quitted his paternal residence at Newington Green, where he was born, and had spent the whole of his early life, and, after living a short time in chambers in the Temple, he removed, about 1803, to a house in St. James's Place, looking into the Green Park. This house he had altered and nearly rebuilt according to his own taste; and in it he resided until his death, on the 18th of December, 1855.

"He has been heard to describe how, on some occasion after the death of his Father, he detected himself making a calculation as to the amount he might expect to accumulate if he continued to devote his whole time to the pursuit of wealth; and he was so shocked by the idea of being influenced by such motives, that he determined to desist from active business, and to attend to it henceforth only occasionally, or when matters of importance made the assistance of his judgment desirable in the affairs of the Bank: a resolution to which he subsequently adhered.

"This resolution gave him leisure to adopt, and indulge in, those pursuits which were more congenial to his taste and judgment; and to foster that love which, in the conclusion to his poem of Italy, he has described himself as having been gifted with by Nature:—

> 'A passionate love for music, sculpture, painting,
> For poetry, the language of the gods,
> For all things here or grand or beautiful,
> A setting sun, a lake among the mountains,
> The light of an ingenuous countenance,
> And what transcends them all, a generous action.'

"With what success he profited by these gifts, and improved the advantages which he has thus described, it must be left to others to decide. His published works, and the reputation he enjoyed through a long life for taste in literature and the fine arts, and for genuine and unobtrusive benevolence, will assist in arriving at a correct opinion, which, it is hoped, will not be unfavourable.

"The time occupied in the composition of each of his several works was considerable, as he was always ready to acknowledge. He pursued a practice, which he often recommended to others, of laying by his poems for a length of time after they were written, in order to reconsider them again and again, before thinking them complete. In illustration of this custom, it may be mentioned, that in his Common-place Book is the following entry, giving the dates of publication of his various works, his own age at the time, and the number of years occupied in the composition and revision of each. These particulars are here given in his own words:

Date of Publication.		*Time.*	*Age.*
1785	Ode	2 years	22
1792	P. of M.	7 „	29
1798	Epistle	6 „	35
1812	Columbus	14 „	49
1813	Jacqueline	1 „	50
1819	Human Life	6 „	56
1834	Italy	15 „	71

"From the year 1834, when, as he has thus described, he completed his last important work, until his death, he had frequent occupation, while his health allowed, in preparing for the press the repeated issues that were called for almost annually of his previously published volumes. After 1834 he wrote no poem of length, though he often introduced new lines and stanzas, or trifling alterations in the successive editions of his works. These changes or additions consisted in part of poetry; but the greater portion of his attention in the latter years of his life, as far as related to his own productions, was given to the notes to his Italy, which he made a medium of recording his thoughts and sentiments on various subjects in connection with the poem. In these notes he took great interest; and the style of them, and the nature of the information conveyed, may be considered as approved by his mature judgment.

"As a proof of the opinion entertained to a late period of his life of the continuance of his powers of mind, and of his taste and judgment in poetry, it may be mentioned that on the death of Mr. Wordsworth in the year 1850, the post of Laureate was offered to him by Her Majesty. This offer, made in a letter from Prince Albert, was in such gratifying terms as to require great strength of mind, and self-denial, on the part of Mr. Rogers to refuse it. He felt, however, that his time of life was so advanced, for he was then 87, as made it imperative on him to decline the honour intended him; and on this ground alone, and after a considerable struggle, he communicated his refusal to His Royal Highness. The appointment was afterwards conferred by Her Majesty on Mr. Tennyson."—Pp. xi—xix.

It cannot be said that these Recollections will enhance in any way Mr. Rogers' reputation, but they will not tarnish it. They are, as the editor justly observes, not open to the charge of "any approach to personal scandal." There is no attempt at dramatic point. Mr. Rogers did not imitate the Boswell style. The chief aim is the selection of noble talkers, of topics not unworthy of the men, and simple accuracy in the record. Some things which we read in these pages have been previously reported in letters and diaries, as they were often the staple of Mr. Rogers' conversation when speaking of the familiar talk of his more eminent friends, spoken "when they were most at their ease, in a morning walk or in an evening by the fire-side." But we are glad to have these things in an authentic form. The Recollections include ten men, beginning with Charles Fox and ending with the Duke of Wellington; and when we remember that of that age another ten might be named nearly, if not quite, as worthy of recollection, we perceive that, compared with "the golden age of Samuel Rogers," it is our lot to live in one of iron.

A larger space in these Recollections is awarded to Charles James Fox than to any other name. The record will give but an imperfect idea of the statesman's grasp of mind and breadth of principle; but it does illustrate his "playfulness, his love of letters and his good-nature." This portion of the Recollections was read by the late Lord Holland "with tears in his eyes." How thoroughly did Fox attach to him all who came within the charmed circle of his personal influence! His follies and vices had not spoilt his noble nature. Parental example, education, his early entrance on public life, were all corrupting. How essentially his was an honest and good heart, to enable him to rise above all the bad influences that from the first surrounded him! The first recollection of Fox that Rogers mentions is at a dinner at William Smith's; and what a party!—Fox, Rogers, Parr, Tierney, Baring, Mackintosh, Dr. Aikin and Sir Philip Francis! And in that group of remarkable men, the star that was brightest was the great leader of the Whig party. Mr. Rogers

was "delighted with his fine tact, his feeling, open and gentlemanlike manner; so full of candour and diffidence, and entering with great ardour and interest into the conversation." It was an indication of Fox's simplicity and good-nature that he was fond of the company of boys. Eton lads were often summoned to St. Anne's Hill. Strange that he should not care for music; still more strange that he had neither eye nor ear for the beauties of Milton. Never was Homer more studied and appreciated than by Fox. He loved all the poets, and found in poetry the essence of human nature and truth. He admired much of Mrs. Barbauld's, both her prose and verse. Strange that, with so pure a taste and with his love for children, he thought her "time misspent in writing books for children," though he acknowledged that "hers were the best." He thought Burns about as clever a man as ever lived; he had a better understanding than Cowper; Tam o'Shanter his best, but the Cotter's Saturday Night best of all! The man whose eloquence was the admiration or the dread of the best thinkers in Europe, was happier in his garden at St. Anne's Hill, or playing at bat, trap and ball, with a lad or two from Eton, or chatting familiarly with the farmers, who never hesitated to stop him in the lanes and talk with him over the pales about corn and the weather, than he ever was in Parliament or the Court. We hope Fox was wrong when he said "he had no reason to think that Burke was a Christian;" as we are sure he was when he argued that scepticism was the only foundation for toleration. That remark shewed how mischievously false religion works on minds like Fox's; scepticism is the necessary reaction against an orthodoxy of which "hell-fire" is the motive power. Even Fox's admirable sense and temper could not always save him from political bigotry, as some of his remarks on Burke, Pitt and Queen Charlotte shew. How our latest philosophers must wonder that Fox, while despising Paley's temporizing, thought many things in his Moral Philosophy very fine! Fox's political difficulties and the partial eclipse which he suffered from the personal dislike of the King, at times injuriously affected his political judgments. From his thorough good-nature and sympathy, he loved popularity, and felt the odium which Toryism had succeeded in attaching to his name. Could he survey the present state of Europe, how would he with his peculiar candour acknowledge, and with his playful laugh renounce, the enormous blunder which he made when he said, "I always say and always think that, of all the countries in Europe, England will be the last to be free. Russia will be free before England. The Russians know no better, and knowledge might and would operate on them to good; but the English have the knowledge and the slavery too." Contrasting the England of 1859 with the England of 1799, how much do we owe to the honest little band of politicians whom Charles Fox led, and may truly say, after Rogers, without concealing one of his errors and faults, whether personal or political,

> "Glorious was his course,
> And long the track of light he left behind him."

Let us, ere we part with Fox, give a specimen or two of his wit:

"When a bitter wind in March blew from the West, and after a time the weathercock shifted to the East—'Yes,' he would say, laughing, 'I knew it would own itself East at last.'"

"When Francis said that Wilberforce, if it was left to him to decide whether Pitt should go out of office for ten months and the Slave-trade be abolished

for ever, or Pitt remain in with the Slave-trade, would decide for Pitt—'Yes,' said Fox, 'I'm afraid he would be for Barabbas.'"

There are some clever things in the recollections (but they are by others, not Rogers himself) of Burke's talk and habits. What he said of his age is true of ours, and probably more or less of every age—"More respect is shewn to talent than to wisdom."

Of Grattan, "glorious Grattan," some acute, a few witty and one or two very fine things are here recorded:

"Pitt would be right nineteen times for once that Fox would be right: *but that once would be worth all the rest. The heart is wiser than the schools.*"

"When Dr. Lucas, a very unpopular man, ventured on a speech in the Irish Parliament, and failed altogether, Grattan said, 'He rose without a friend, and sate down without an enemy.'"

How much is told in Rogers' description of Grattan:

"His forte in conversation is sketching a character, with a gentle voice and many pauses; but with a delicate irony, a great archness of look and manner; beginning, as you would think, with something like praise, and ending with a roll of the person and a turn of the head, in a *coup de Patte.*"

The recollections of Porson contain the noble letter in which he indicated his purpose to forego his election to the Greek Chair in the University of Cambridge if subscription to the Articles were required from the Professor.

We must pass over the recollections of Horne Tooke (many of which are admirable), Talleyrand, Erskine, Sir Walter Scott and Lord Grenville; and of the Duke of Wellington we have space to record little more than the memorable words spoken after the Battle of Waterloo at Brussels, in the presence of Lady Mornington and her daughter. Walking up and down the apartment in a state of the greatest agitation, he burst into tears and said, "The next greatest misfortune to losing a battle is to gaining such a victory as this." If we add another line, it must be to preserve that fine remark uttered by the Duke in 1838, and spoken with deep emotion, "What is that rara avis, Common Sense? It is, I believe, a good understanding, moderated and modulated by a good heart."

A Memoir of the late Rev. George Armstrong, formerly Incumbent of Bangor in the Diocese of Down, and latterly one of the Ministers of Lewin's-Mead Chapel, Bristol. With Extracts from his Journals and Correspondence. By Robert Henderson, his Literary Executor. 8vo. Pp. 400. London—Whitfield.

We cannot treat this volume as we fain would, and express in detail our sense of its varied interest and permanent value, because its author honoured us by making the pages of the *Christian Reformer* the medium through which the public first became acquainted with the Memoir. There is, however, no impropriety in our saying that Mr. Henderson has finished his task with all the ability and in the fine spirit in which he began it in our pages, and that many of the extracts from the journals and letters in the latter moiety of the volume are of the deepest interest.

Mr. Armstrong was one of nature's noblemen—true, honourable, generous, a warm lover of liberty in every form, and with a heart full of sympathy for them that suffered in its behalf. His intellectual powers were of an order that enabled him to grasp truth in many of its most

important departments firmly; and such was the strength of his moral nature, that when he had once comprehended a truth he never let it go. He was not like some of those wayward beings, intellectual children, who treat truth as a toy, a thing to fondle to-day and to cast aside to-morrow in favour of something newer or more glittering. His genial manners and warm affections made him a delightful companion. Such were his moral, intellectual and social qualifications, that wherever he went he left his mark. They who conversed with him but half-an-hour could not fail to know where his convictions and sympathies lay, and why. His renunciation of a gainful orthodoxy and public profession of the least profitable (as far as this world goes) nonconformity, marked the honesty and courage that were essential to his nature. It is no slight argument in favour of Unitarian Christianity that it could attract, convince, and to the last hour of his life satisfy, a mind and heart like his. With him, however, Unitarianism was no mere negation of "orthodoxy" (a view of it sometimes held, but one with which he had no sympathy), but a vital Christianity, satisfying his intellect and warming his heart. Few men have better borne the severe test which is involved in an entire change of religious opinion. That which in some instances has led to an intellectual and even a moral shipwreck, in his case gave vigour to his convictions and warmth and catholicity to his sympathies. He rejoiced in a religious system which, contradicting and cramping none of his best thoughts and most generous aspirations, enabled him to love God and man with a growing ardour, and to entertain cheering views of the future. The longer he realized the influences of Unitarian Christianity, the more he appreciated it, and the more anxious did he become to hand it down to others in its scriptural strength and simplicity, unperverted by that mystical and sceptical philosophy, the influence of which he deplored and honestly resisted.—We are glad to possess a record both faithful and affectionate of Mr. Armstrong's life and character, and we hope it will soon find a place in every vestry library belonging to our churches, and have a welcome in every family circle in which Unitarianism (both name and substance) is valued. We cannot refrain, having opened the volume afresh, from making one or two extracts from the correspondence which are at this time especially interesting. Our first extract is of a letter of his to Sir John Bowring, and that gentleman's reply:

"Durdham Park, March 8, 1857.

"Dear Sir John,—If in your distant as well as very arduous and exalted position, you ever have time or opportunity for knowing or thinking anything about your theological connections in England, you will have perhaps been apprised, before this reaches you, of my unhappily altered relation to the church in whose cause I have for many years laboured, and in whose promotion and advancement I have for very long been most earnestly interested.

"You are not to suppose, however, that it is on my own account, or to talk of myself and my poor concerns, that I now resolve to trouble you with these few hasty lines. Very different, and more worthy, is my object in doing so. It is, in short, to evince, in however feeble and humble a manner, my profound sympathy in your present almost unexampled trials; and my no less perfect conviction that you will come out of the trial with a success the more complete,—if that phrase can be admitted,—and a reputation the more brilliant and lasting, in proportion to the fulness and honesty of the inquiries which may be directed into the motives, the necessities and the details of the momentous proceedings into which you have been launched, under circumstances of

the most perilous and awful responsibility and difficulty by which a public servant was ever surrounded.

"Parliamentary faction is about to experience the reward it has so well earned, and your pure character, and the best service of your country and of humanity, will, I doubt not, ere long be shewn to the whole world to stand upon one common pedestal, never to be overthrown while England has a history. The press of England, like its political parties, is split into divers forms of sham and folly in reference to your Chinese proceedings; but proud I am to see, and glad I am to forward to you by same post with this, an admirable specimen of good sense and right feeling on the part of our Bristol press in relation thereto, in an able journal, the *Bristol Advertiser*, established about a year ago.

"With earnest prayers to the God of nations for a happy issue to you and to our country out of the afflictions and difficulties of the present crisis both at home and in the far East, and an honourable and happy return to you and yours to a grateful country and a peaceful home, believe me, dear Sir John, yours faithfully, "G. A."

"Hong Kong, May 7, 1857.

"My dear Sir,—I thank you much for your kind letter, one of the sweet serene voices which have reached me, to be heard and welcomed in the midst of furious thunder.

"I little dreamed that the course I was taking to defend my country's rights and wounded honour would have subjected me to be dealt with more mercilessly than if I had been a common felon, a foul malefactor. I little thought that our 'Arrow' was to hit the target of a world's concerns, that it was to shake a Ministry, break up a Parliament, to agitate more than all Europe. But after all, the most thoughtful self-examination, the repose of the pillow, the questionings of the conscience, have not persuaded me that I have done wrong; and I doubt not, I cannot doubt, that out of the mass of slime and slander goodly fruits will grow.

"I deeply appreciate, cordially welcome, gratefully acknowledge your words of kindness, so unhesitating and courageous—for some of my *friends* have expressed doubtful confidence. 'We knew you would not lie;'—indeed not. But to have been selected as a victim (the Admiral, a noble fellow, a party at every stage and step, and the actor, while I was but the adviser, is disgusted with the attempt to dissociate him) is, after all, an honour. I have been shot at, wounded, and obliged to leave the field, not by the courage or stratagem of the enemy;—no, the attacks have come from our own ranks,—from men who knew the stuff they sought to vilify,—but who, once engaged, seemed determined to stop at nothing.

"The field of politics, like the field of battle, must have its victims. I believe I should have conducted affairs to an honourable and successful issue. I shall cordially aid and help the new Plenipotentiary to do so, and, whatever be my fate, the country will not suffer by my temporary supercession.

"It must have been a grateful event for you to close your public services at Lewin's-Mead in such a bright sunset as was gathered about you, and to know full well that you had laboured, successfully laboured, in the sowings and the reapings and the gatherings of the harvests of truth and liberty,—not always so prolific as we had prayed and hoped for, but always bringing something to the garner of progress and the records of improvement. And so, my dear Sir, so continue to labour, and, if labour's task is over, to love and encourage other labourers. "Ever very faithfully yours,

"John Bowring."

How well adapted to our position to-day, with fanaticism manifesting itself on all sides around us, and defection and other causes of anxiety troubling us within, are the words Mr. Armstrong wrote to a young friend studying at Cambridge about nine years ago:

"What a time it is for Unitarianism if it knew how to profit by its opportunity; but alas! the religious, or irreligious, stirring of men's minds in these latter days has visited our borders with no less strange manifestations, though of a different character, than we have witnessed elsewhere. An affected liberalism would throw down all barriers, and, in the aim of embracing all, has ended in grasping nothing; it resigns or derides its creed, and the seekers of the age are prone to understand that Unitarians have nothing to offer them, and go to other folds to knock for admission. Yet I trust we have some true spirits among us who understand our position, our interests and our duties,—men not to be driven from post to pillar by the eloquent effusions of Mr. Fox, or the more earnest and captivating mysticism of Mr. Newman."—P. 399.

The letter that follows was from Dr. Channing, in acknowledgment of Mr. Armstrong's admirable work (on which his reputation as an author will rest), entitled, "Infallibility not possible, Involuntary Error not culpable:"

"Boston, July 21, 1828.

"Dear Sir,—Your letter gave me great pleasure. Many of your expressions of approbation I am compelled by my self-knowledge to limit, perhaps I should say to disclaim. But whilst I question the soundness of the estimate which many make of my labours, I do not the less rejoice in the proofs which occasionally come to me that what I have written has been quickening and exalting to some of my fellow-beings. I have a deep conviction that Christianity was intended to communicate energy and elevation far beyond what we yet witness, and that our nature was made and is fitted for the sublimest influences of this religion. If I have helped to spread this conviction,—if I have awakened in any soul a consciousness of its powers and greatness,—if I have thrown any light on the grandeur of God's purposes towards his rational creatures,—if I have done anything to expose the monstrous error that curbs and chains are the indispensable and best means of educating the individual and the race, or if I have vindicated for the mind that freedom which is the chief element and condition of its growth,—then I have accomplished the end to which I have devoted my powers. I thank you most sincerely for encouraging me to hope that I have not been wholly unsuccessful. I feel my poor labours (for I cannot estimate them very highly) recompensed beyond measure by such language as you have used; you have given me a kind of approbation which I may enjoy without injury to my virtue; for your letter breathes sympathy much more than it expresses praise. I thank you and I thank God for this. Truth, though not responded to, is still truth; but how are we strengthened and encouraged when, having sent it abroad, it comes back to us in tones which shew that it has penetrated the inmost souls of some at least who have heard it.

"The work which you sent me gave me much pleasure; it seems to me that you have taken the true and only defensible ground. Most Protestants betray their cause by virtually siding with the doctrine of infallibility; they are unwilling that Rome should thunder against heresy; they have no objection to the thunder itself, if it may only break from the clouds of their own orthodoxy. I heartily wish you success in your conflict with the spirit of tyranny and exclusion, whether in Catholic or Protestant."—Pp. 339, 340.

Surnames metrically arranged and classified; with an Introductory Inquiry into their Origin and Use. By Thomas Clark, Esq. London—Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

This is the age of cheap and amusing literature; and of the number of books of this class which a prolific press is constantly sending forth to the public, we commend the above little *brochure* to the attention of those of our readers who may wish to beguile pleasantly an idle hour,

or to interest and divert the mind wearied by the demands of business. Rarely have we read a book furnishing so much amusement. Every page excites a smile or provokes our laughter. Though on an antiquarian subject, the author, who bears an honoured name in our church, avoids the dull and learned disquisitions common to such researches; and after shewing in a brief and popular form

> "What's in a name?
> What are the uses, forms and nature
> Of our domestic nomenclature?
> Whence do our names originate,
> And from what era take their date?"

proceeds to present us with "many thousands" of patronymics "scattered here and there throughout Great Britain and its dependencies," metrically arranged and classified. Mr. Clark evidently possesses the faculty of classification in a very high degree, and would have taken conspicuous rank in any one of the sciences in which this peculiar mental idiosyncrasy is called into requisition. We must confess also that he has great facility in versification; and in this respect his book is certainly one of the most remarkable productions we have seen. His classification comprises patronymics derived from adjectives, adverbs, animals, birds, buildings, carriages, characters, Christian names, clothing or dress, coins, colours, compass (the), consanguinity, counties, &c. &c., and he gives a numerous, in some cases a long, list under each, with an appendix containing miscellaneous and compound names, and Guildford and Godalming surnames, the immediate neighbourhood of the author's residence, and some laughable stanzas on Horace Smith's remark, "Surnames go by contraries." We present our readers with one extract:

> "To *solid food* we now must turn,
> Another set of names to learn:
> As Bacon, Butter, Pepper, Salt,
> Sugar, Candy, Ginger, Malt;
> Cracknell, Cabbage, Pudden, Pye,
> Dumpling, Carrott, Garlick, Rye;
> Brawn, Lamb, Fennell, Corn and Rice,
> Drybutter, Crust, Crum, Cake and Spice;
> Honey, Eggs, Flesh, Fowle and Veal,
> Gibbletts, Gammon, Barley, Meal;
> Jelley, Hogsflesh, Fatt and Lean,
> Mutton, Mustard, Gourd and Bean;
> Onions, Parsley, Spinnage, Wheat,
> Lambshead, Lickorish and Beet;
> Pickles, Peascod, Pigfat, Pine,
> Muffin, Sage, Oates, Maize and Chine;
> Rolls, Rusk, Suet, Leek and Lamb,
> Tripe, Tart, Trotter, Pease and Ham;
> Sop, Sustenance, Rue, Mint and Thyme,
> Mess, Pottage, Fare, Fresh, Meat and Brine;
> With Bunn, Curd, Gristle, Cakebread, Grist:
> And thus, at length, we close the list
> Of names derived from *solid food*,
> Which certainly are somewhat rude,
> But very useful, all must grant,
> Since 'tis *variety* we want."

OBITUARY.

July 15, at Reading, aged 49, Miss Lydia Allright Slaughter, daughter of the late Mr. Samuel Slaughter. Living in a town which enjoyed not the benefit of a Unitarian place of worship, she with her esteemed father never hesitated to avow on all suitable occasions her Unitarian convictions; and she subscribed to those Associations among us which have in view the diffusion of what she regarded the true gospel of Christ. The spirit of devotion was deeply inwrought into her nature, and was ever prompting her to bring others under the influence of religion and of her own scriptural faith, esteeming it best calculated to produce the true elevation of the Christian character. Others there were in Reading who were known to be Unitarians, but Miss Slaughter's truthful spirit and free expression of opinions naturally attracted towards her those who were interested in the promotion of Unitarian Christianity in the district, and to her they looked for information as to the best and most likely means of introducing it with advantage. We may conceive but can hardly describe the satisfaction she experienced when the Rev. H. E. Howse removed to Reading, and opened a room in his own house for the worship of the one Jehovah, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The object for which she had seemed to live was then accomplished, and joyous were the feelings with which she at once became an attendant on his ministry. But this enjoyment was not of long duration. The seeds of an insidious disease lurked in her constitution, and soon deprived her of the privilege of joining her esteemed fellow-worshipers. Confined to her room by her painful malady, she awaited with anxious interest every Sabbath evening for the slip of paper conveyed by one of the household of the pastor with the particulars of the services, viz., what hymns were sung, what portions of Scripture were read, and what the text and subject of the sermons, and number of attendants.

Throughout her long illness she was resigned and cheerful, as if her mission had been to shew those of her fellow-christians who differ from her in faith, how a Unitarian Christian under severe trial can live and die happily. She is now gone to her rest, but her memory is sweet to her friends, and the influence of her example will not be lost to the little band of worshipers at Reading.

E. K.

July 20, at her residence, Warwick Place, Leamington, Miss Sarah Lawrence, formerly of the Grange, Gateacre, near Liverpool. In her many have lost a valued friend, whose words of encouragement and instruction will doubtless long dwell in their hearts and memories. "She being dead, yet speaketh."

Aug. 17, at Holway, near Taunton, Mary, the wife of Downing Blake, Esq., in her 90th year.

Aug. 20, greatly and deservedly respected, aged 68, Miss I. B. Mitchell, of Manchester, daughter of the late Mr. T. Mitchell, of Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Aug. 29, at Pen Leonard, Exeter, aged 20, Bessie, the eldest daughter of Rev. G. B. Brock.

Aug. 31, at the residence of her daughter, Hagley Road, Birmingham, very suddenly, aged 73, Louisa, relict of Joseph Powell, of Exeter, merchant, and daughter of the late Henry Cort.

Sept. 13, at his residence, Tytherington Hall, near Macclesfield, Wm. Brocklehurst, Esq., in his 76th year.

Sept. 18, at the residence of his father, Eagley House, Stockport Road, Manchester, in the 36th year of his age, John Ashton Nicholls, Esq. Of this excellent and public-spirited man, who was a zealous supporter of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board and of other Unitarian institutions, we extract from the *Manchester Examiner and Times* the following obituary notice:

"Seldom have we had a more painful duty to perform than that of recording the death of Mr. John Ashton Nicholls. This sad event took place at Eagley House, Stockport Road, the residence of his father, Alderman B. Nicholls, on Sunday afternoon. He attained the 36th year of his age in March last. The interest he took in the last two elections for this city is well known. On the last occasion his voice was heard from the hustings as the seconder of Mr. Thomas Bazley, and at the meetings which preceded the nomination his clear, earnest and impressive eloquence frequently disarmed political opposition. His own self-denial was at the same period severely tested by an invitation to stand for Nottingham; and, we

believe, his chief, if not his sole, ground for declining—and it was creditable to him—was a thoughtful consideration for his father; he would not throw upon him, at his time of life, the entire management of a business which was become so large as to require their combined attention. Mr. Nicholls had all the advantages of a good classical education and extensive travel. He was regarded as a gentleman of much public promise, and this, combined with great private worth, ensured him a large circle of warm-hearted friends. His literary and scientific acquirements were of no mean order; he took a special interest in the study of astronomy, and was a fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society. In this pursuit he was frequently associated with our late respected fellow-citizen, the Rev. H. H. Jones, astronomer to the corporation. Mr. Nicholls was in possession of an excellent private observatory and good instruments. He became a member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society in 1854; and was also a life member of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at whose meeting in Aberdeen he intended to be present. The Manchester Athenæum has lost in him an active supporter; he was one of its most assiduous directors, and in 1857 officiated as chairman of the board. His efforts, however, were by no means restricted to associations connected with the higher and middle classes. The industrious poor had in him a kind-hearted friend, and they had many opportunities of witnessing his endeavours to promote their intellectual, social and moral elevation. In his occasional lectures to them, in the People's Institute, it was easy to see that they placed great reliance upon his goodwill, and they would listen to reproof from him with a gentleness which they would scarcely have brooked from any other, knowing that he had no other object beyond the promotion of their welfare. Although not in the enjoyment, for some time past, of his previously robust health, it was only during the last two or three weeks that serious apprehensions began to be awakened. He was attended by Dr. Ashton and Mr. J. Shepherd Fletcher, who found him to be suffering from inflammation of the bowels and peritoneum, and which ultimately proved fatal. His bereaved parents will have many deep sympathizers for the loss which they and the city of Manchester have sustained."

Sept. 19, at his father's residence, Carr House, near Leeds, after a long and painful illness, Mr. Joseph Henry Oates, Jun., of Leeds, solicitor, lamented and beloved by his family and friends, respected and esteemed by all who knew him.

MARRIAGES.

Aug. 20, at the New meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Henry M'Kean, of Oldbury, Mr. Charles Wilks to Miss Ann Haslewood, both of Birmingham.

Aug. 21, at the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-on-Tyne, by Rev. George Harris, Mr. William Henry Slater to Jane Hymers, both of Newcastle.

Aug. 27, at the Unitarian chapel, Kingswood, King's Norton, by Rev. J. Fox, of Mossley, Lancashire, Rev. J. Heywood, minister of Kingswood, to Miss Platt, of Newcastle, Staffordshire.

Aug. 27, at Eustace-Street chapel, Dublin, by the father of the bridegroom, Henry Felix Thomas to Sarah, second daughter of George Fowler, Esq., Chenyfield House, near Dublin.

Aug. 30, at the Presbyterian meeting-house, Altringham, by Rev. John Robberds, B.A., Rev. Chas. Wm. Robberds, of Oldham, to Catherine, daughter of Rev. T. C. Holland.

Sept. 1, at St. Saviourgate chapel, York, by Rev. G. Vance Smith, B.A., W. Alfred Wansey, Esq., of Birkenhead, to Miss Emma Dawson.

Sept. 1, at Barton-Street chapel, Gloucester, by Rev. J. G. Teggin, Mr. J. Yapp to Emily Harriet, eldest daughter of Mr. J. Mills, of that city.

Sept. 1, at the meeting-house of the First Presbyterian congregation, Rosemary Street, Belfast, by the father of the bride, Herbert, fifth son of the late James Darbishire, Esq., Green Heys, near Manchester, to Maria, fifth daughter of the Rev. William Bruce, the Farm, near Belfast.

Sept. 3, at Hackney, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Thos. Chatfeild Clarke, son of the late Abraham Clarke, Esq., Newport, Isle of Wight, to Ellen, daughter of John Sutton Nettlefold, Esq., the Grove, Highgate, Middlesex.

Sept. 6, at the Church of the Divine Unity, Newcastle-on-Tyne, by Rev. George Harris, Mr. William Thynn to Hannah Nicholson, both of Newcastle.